

AMERICAN HISTORY



Vol. III

SEPTEMBER, 1934

No. 3

LUTHERANISM AND THE REFORMED FAITH
ON THE CONTINENT

Adolf Keller

AUGUSTINE OF HIPPO, SERVUS SERVORUM CHRISTI

R. Pierce Beaver

CHURCH AND STATE IN SPAIN

Charles S. Braden

WAS FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE A
BROAD-CHURCHMAN?

Charles Richard Sanders

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Published by

The American Society of Church History

THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

FOUNDED BY PHILIP SCHAFF, 1888: REORGANIZED, 1906: INCORPORATED BY ACT OF THE
LEGISLATURE OF NEW YORK, 1916

OFFICERS FOR 1934

FREDERICK WILLIAM LOETSCHER.....*President*
JOHN THOMAS MCNEILL*Vice-President*
ABDEL ROSS WENTZ.....*Secretary*
ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS.....*Treasurer*
MATTHEW SPINKA.....*Assistant Secretary*

OTHER MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

WILLIAM WALKER ROCKWELL	WILLIAM WARREN SWEET
GEORGE WARREN RICHARDS	CONRAD HENRY MOEHLMAN
WINFRED ERNEST GARRISON	WILHELM PAUCK
EDWARD STRONG WORCESTER	ROLAND H. BAINTON
WILLIAM DAVID SCHERMERHORN	SHIRLEY JACKSON CASE

EDITORIAL BOARD OF CHURCH HISTORY

MATTHEW SPINKA, *Managing Editor*
ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS
FREDERICK WILLIAM LOETSCHER, *ex officio*

PUBLICATION OFFICE, BERNE, INDIANA

EXECUTIVE AND EDITORIAL OFFICE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

CHURCH HISTORY is a quarterly journal published in March, June, September, December by the American Society of Church History. The subscription price is Three Dollars per year. The price of single copies is seventy-five cents. To foreign countries, the postage of twenty-five cents a year must be added. Subscriptions should be sent to Professor Matthew Spinka, 5757 University Ave., Chicago, Illinois, or to Professor Robert Hastings Nichols, 10 Nelson Street, Auburn, New York. Remittances should be made to the order of American Society of Church History.

All communications regarding contributions, book reviews, and other matters of editorial nature should be sent to Professor Matthew Spinka, 5757 University Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.

Claims for missing numbers and changes of address should be addressed to Prof. R. H. Nichols, 10 Nelson St., Auburn, N. Y.

Entered as second-class matter March 9, 1934, at the post office at Berne, Ind., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

CHURCH HISTORY

EDITORIAL BOARD

MATTHEW SPINKA, *Managing Editor*

ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS

FREDERICK WILLIAM LOETSCHER, *ex officio*

Vol. III

SEPTEMBER, 1934

No. 3

CONTENTS

LUTHERANISM AND THE REFORMED FAITH ON THE CONTINENT

Adolf Keller 173

AUGUSTINE OF HIPPO, SERVUS SERVORUM CHRISTI

R. Pierce Beaver 187

CHURCH AND STATE IN SPAIN

Charles S. Braden 207

WAS FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE A BROAD-CHURCHMAN?

Charles Richard Sanders 222

BOOK REVIEWS 232

FABER, GEOFFREY: *Oxford Apostles*.....Gaius G. Atkins

MATHEWS, BASIL: *John R. Mott, World Citizen*....Charles S. Braden

BAKER, ARCHIBALD G.: *Christian Missions and
a New World Culture*.....Charles S. Braden

VULLIAMY, C. E.: *William Penn*.....Maurice C. Latta

GIBBS, M. AND LANG, J.: *Bishops and Reform,
1215-1272*.....F. W. Buckler

JANIN, PÈRE: *The Separated Eastern Churches*.....Matthew Spinka

STOWE, L. B.: *Saints, Sinners and Beechers*..Robert Hastings Nichols

HULL, W. I.: *Willem Sewel of Amsterdam*.....D. Elton Trueblood

MATHEW, DAVID AND GERVASE: *The Reformation and
the Contemplative Life*.....John T. McNeill

CONTENTS

ROWE, H. K.: <i>History of Andover Theological Seminary</i>	Daniel Evans
MCDOWELL, W. F.: <i>Creative Men</i>	A. W. Nagler

BOOK NOTICES

245

BUDGE, SIR E. A. W., Transl.: <i>One Hundred and Ten Miracles of Our Lady Mary</i>	
SCHILLING, F. A.: <i>The Mysticism of St. Ignatius of Antioch</i>	
BARTOS, F. M.: <i>Lipany</i>	

gift

Prof Knappen

6-16-52

v. 3, no. 3; 5:1; 11:2; 15:3-4

16:1-2; 4; 17-20:1.

Church History

Vol. III

SEPTEMBER, 1934

No. 3

LUTHERANISM AND THE REFORMED FAITH ON THE CONTINENT

ADOLF KELLER

Geneva, Switzerland

It is a well known fact that the Lutheran Reformation has found entrance mostly into the nations of the Germanic race. The larger part of Germany and the northern countries around the Baltic Sea are Lutheran. Lutheranism has also gathered small groups in France, Holland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, but it is safe to say that there exists a certain affinity between the Lutheran faith and the Germanic race. The Reformed faith, in the form of Calvinism or of the Zwinglian Reformation, has a more international character. From its birthplaces in Zürich and Geneva it penetrated into France, Holland, Scotland, Hungary, Lithuania, and conquered even the House of Hohenzollern. The relationship between the two confessions, considered from a statistical point of view, has undergone but little change in the last few centuries. The most important alterations perhaps have taken place as a result of the union in the Church of Prussia and of the formation of the Czechoslovak Church of the Czech Brethren. The Reformed faith has been nearly extinguished in Russia where the larger parishes disappeared or were dissolved into Lutheran parishes. In Greece a young Presbyterian church is in the process of formation, and was considerably increased by the emigration of Greek refugees from Anatolia where the Southern Presbyterians had planted a hopeful missionary church.

The present situation of the two great Protestant communions on the Continent is influenced by the general crisis, the interdenominational movement towards unity, the reawakening

of the denominational consciousness, and the German revolution. We deal with these various aspects in the following chapters:

1. THE INFLUENCE OF THE CRISIS ON THE TWO
CHURCH BODIES

The Lutheran churches have felt the crisis during and after the war in a more serious way, because they belong mostly, except the Scandinavian churches, to the belligerent nations. The Lutheran churches in Germany, in the Baltic states, in Poland, in Rumania and Yugoslavia have passed through great distress and hard privations. Most of their endowments have been wiped out by the war. Along the Baltic coast, especially in Latvia, hundreds of church buildings have been destroyed. The Lutheran church in Poland could not have settled its refugees coming back from Russia without the help from American Lutherans.

The Reformed churches in France have also undergone heavy losses, but their ruins have been rebuilt mostly with the help of American Protestants. In Hungary and Rumania Lutheran as well as Reformed people had to endure the same difficulties.

This distress had a stimulating effect upon their spiritual life. A great effort has been made to rebuild the destroyed churches and reconquer influence in the nations, and quite a number of new churches have been formed parallel to the new states, as for instance in Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. The present economic crisis means again a great danger for both of these church bodies. The problem of debts is becoming appalling for a number of them, especially in Belgium and Czechoslovakia. The distress has a specific influence on the recruiting of the clergy. The number of theological students was tremendously decreased during and after the war. In certain countries there is a painful lack of ministers, as for instance in Poland, on account of which older ministers are compelled to remain too long in service. This situation has also an influence on the education of the clergy. Several of these churches were obliged to admit ministers with inferior education, and in certain countries women were admitted to the ministry. The crisis has especially been detrimental to the Evangelical school both of the Lutheran and the Reformed type. This is particularly the case in Transylvania where a large

Calvinistic church of Hungarian race is struggling quite as much as the Lutheran Saxon church for the maintenance of the traditional confessional school.

2. THE INFLUENCE OF THE ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT ON THE CONFESSIONAL SITUATION

The Ecumenical Movement in modern times began with the preparations for the ecumenical conferences of Stockholm and Lausanne. The Stockholm Movement on Life and Work tried to prepare a common ground for practical cooperation between church bodies of different types. It included not only Lutherans and Reformed, but also the other non-Roman types of Christian churches. One of the obstacles which this movement found on its way was the confessional consciousness. When Archbishop Soederblom invited the Christian churches to attend the Universal Conference at Stockholm, the Lutheran Archbishop of Finland protested in a vehement way against such an attempt to overcome the existing obstacles to practical collaboration. The Finnish delegation therefore attended the Conference in an unofficial capacity. Many of the confessional Lutherans even in Germany were more than lukewarm towards the Ecumenical Movement, accusing it of neglecting confessional truth in the attempt to find a common basis for practical work. Generally speaking, the Reformed churches showed less intransigence in this respect than the confessional Lutherans.

Nevertheless, the basis for practical collaboration between Lutherans and Reformed became broader and broader, first on the mission field, where various types of missionary societies collaborated together in an international or a national council.

In the European Central Bureau for Inter-Church Aid, which was founded in 1922 in Copenhagen, the first attempt was made to complement denominational relief by a broad inter-denominational Protestant inter-church aid. It was an expression of the stronger ecumenical spirit in the Reformed faith that Reformed churches were more willing to support Lutheran churches and church projects than confessional Lutherans were to help their Reformed brethren. The International Protestant Loan Association, founded by the Central Bureau, granted loans to 85% from Lutheran bodies while the shares came to 98% from the Reformed side. Church bodies like those in Switzerland and in Scotland declared frequently that they were

not exclusively interested in denominational aid but in the common Protestant cause. During the Conference on Faith and Order in Lausanne a joint meeting of Lutheran and Reformed delegates took place. It had become overwhelmingly clear that there existed a common Protestant front between Lutherans and Reformed, as against the Anglican and Orthodox interpretation of the place of the nation and the task of the church. It was realized on both sides that the Bible as sole source of our faith, justification by faith, the universal priesthood of believers, and liberty of conscience were a spiritual capital large enough in both communions to produce a kind of spiritual fellowship between Lutherans and Reformed. An attempt was made to formulate this community of faith in a joint statement, but after that date the ecumenical movement encountered a growing confessional consciousness which did not allow it to go very far.

The anniversary of the disputation of Marburg of 1529 was very significant in this respect. The faculty of Marburg had succeeded in bringing together a large conference composed of Lutheran and Reformed bodies, and Professor Otto made a proposal to establish a kind of a Protestant senate which would be capable of making statements from a common Protestant point of view. Professor Otto found at that time that the ecumenical movement should be built upon three pillars: the Protestant, the Anglican, and the Orthodox. He saw far-reaching possibilities of collaboration between Lutheran and Reformed bodies. The European Central Bureau, whose committee includes representatives of all Protestant church federations, was considered as the nucleus of such a Protestant joint body with the possibility of widening its scope and enlarging its tasks. These Marburg proposals corresponded in fact to the proposal which had been made at Oud-Wassenaar, Holland, immediately after the war by the Swiss churches, for the formation, not of an ecumenical movement of the present kind, but of a large joint Protestant body. Archbishop Soederblom, caring very much about the participation of Anglicans, was opposed to such a formation which, however, took place a few years later in the general Protestant Association of which Minister Slotemaker, Holland, is the president.

These attempts at reaching a stronger Protestant unity were more or less replaced by the ecumenical movements of Stockholm and Lausanne. They offered a common ground where Lutherans and Reformed could meet and realize to a

growing extent their essential unity in faith. The European section of the Universal Council on Life and Work is now such an official church council including Lutheran and Reformed churches with the view of joint practical tasks. In various countries the World Conference on Faith and Order stimulated the building up of joint study groups dealing with theological problems and preparing thus the ground for a theological approach of the two confessions. This is also the case with the ecumenical study conferences arranged by the International Christian Social Institute in Geneva. One of the recent study conferences made an inquiry into the theological background of the social activity of the churches. It became clear, for instance, that the Lutherans have a different approach to social work than the Reformed. The Lutherans find much stimulus in the Lutheran idea of vocation while the Reformed are starting from the question of the will of God to be done in the city of God. This led to a lively controversy on the conception of the social activity of the church as understood by Lutherans or Reformed, and this controversy is one of the main aspects in that stimulating conversation which has been in progress for ten years between American and European Protestantism.

The pessimistic and eschatological conception of the task of the church in the midst of the world is largely due to the Lutheran conception of the world and of the place of the Christians in this world. The world is more or less the devil's place. It is not the plastic element which could be moulded by Christian idealism. The Christian has to take the deep-reaching demonic opposition of the world against God very seriously and should take care not to fall into that social and optimistic idealism which seems to Lutherans so characteristic of American Puritanism. The criticism of American "activism" came mostly from Lutheran observers who felt a certain pride in the attempt of Calvinists to conquer and transform the world for God's sake. Luther's conception of the world as being under the wrath of God is always alive in Lutheran circles and does not allow them to enter with the same enthusiasm into the sphere of an idealistic social activity as the Reformed, especially Americans, are daring to do.

There is no doubt that the present ecumenical movement is counterbalanced by the growing denominational consciousness. This will lead us to the theological aspects of the problem with which we shall deal later. Suffice it to say here that a large

part of Lutheran bodies are more interested in what they call ecumenical Lutheranism than in ecumenical Protestantism. The strengthening of the Lutheran denominational consciousness is partly due to influence from America, where Lutherans were opposed to most of the interdenominational movements and for instance did not enter into the Federal Council. The American Lutherans of a more exclusive type, seconded by representatives of the same consciousness, refused therefore to participate in the celebration at Marburg and preferred to have their own special celebration. Such lack of cooperation hampered also a larger development of the European Central Bureau for Inter-Church Aid.

On the other hand it must be said that a stronger denominational consciousness developed also in certain Reformed bodies, especially in Holland, where Abraham Kuyper had formed an exclusive orthodox Reformed Church, and is vehemently opposed to any latitudinarianism in the church, refusing therefore collaboration with more broad-minded Reformed bodies. This Reformed consciousness was connected with national consciousness particularly in the Hungarian Reformed Church, where the Calvinist Hungarians are considered as being more exclusively interested in the national destiny than the Lutherans, who originally were more of German or Slovak extraction.

In spite of such differences and of theological controversies, the destiny of the evangelical faith on the Continent stimulates also the developing of a common Protestant consciousness which finds its expression in the above-mentioned interdenominational organizations and in a certain amount of mutual help and responsibility for each other.

3. CONTROVERSIAL THEOLOGY BETWEEN LUTHERANISM AND THE REFORMED CHURCHES

The growing denominational consciousness in Lutheranism as well as in Calvinism found a theological expression in what may be called neo-Lutheranism and neo-Calvinism.¹ Both may be characterised as a rebirth of the spirit of the Reformation. Continental Protestantism in the Lutheran as well as in the Reformed churches had undergone to a large extent the levelling influences of modernism and relativism. The distinctive fea-

¹ See the corresponding chapters in my Stone Lectures published under the title *Revolution and Religion*, by Fleming H. Revell, New York, 1934.

tures of the historic faith were largely forgotten or neglected in a number of churches which had even partly abolished their historical declarations of faith as compulsory, as for instance in Switzerland, and had replaced the old historic denomination-alism by a broad-minded and shallow latitudinarianism. The reaction against this modernism is due not simply to a group of single theologians or schools, but to a general desire to find a new orientation in the present chaos of life and to discover it in the fundamental doctrines of the Reformation.

Neo-Calvinism found its strongest expression in what is called the Barthian Movement or the Dialectical Theology. Although this group included not only Reformed but also Lutheran theologians such as Gogarten and Merz, its characteristic features are of a more Calvinistic type. The Calvinistic elements in this theology can be found in the emphasis laid upon the doctrine of the sovereignty of God. The whole theology is focused in this chief Calvinistic doctrine, which is emphasized so strongly that an immanentist theology is rebuked as unevangelical and unbiblical. The sovereignty of God and its characteristic expression in the doctrine of predestination are not only the central position in Reformed theology and preaching, but also the condition for all kinds of social activity. Another Reformed element in Barthianism is the exclusive fashion in which Barth himself is opposing a synthesis between revelation and other principles of theological explication, such as reason, Christian consciousness and cultural ethos. It is a theology without "ifs" and "ands." The Reformed character of this theology can also be seen in the stress which is laid upon the local congregation as the fundamental cell in the social structure of the church. This means a democratic character in the constitution of the church which is opposed to an episcopal constitution. Barth and his Reformed friends, Brunner and Thurneysen, stand not alone in this struggle, but are supported by independent Calvinists like LeCerf in Paris, de Saussure in Geneva, and Dutch and Hungarian theologians who emphasize in the same way these original Calvinistic elements of the modern neo-Calvinism.

The reawakening Lutheran consciousness has been stimulated not only by large confessional gatherings but also by some theologians such as Althaus, Elert and Sasse in Germany, Aulen and Runestam in Sweden. Their central doctrine is justification by faith. Lutheran theology feels therefore less

driven to plunge into social work and has a more optimistic and joyful conception of grace than the predestinarian interpretation of salvation in the Reformed doctrine.

This growing Lutheran consciousness is falling back of course upon the Augsburg Confession, and especially on the former edition of the *Confessio invariata* which does not yet show the mitigating influence of Melanchthon and is distinctly exclusive in respect of the Reformed faith. Modern Lutheran theologians like Elert, Stapel and Schomerus show a rather intransigent attitude towards the Reformed conception and are far from forgetting the day of Marburg, 1529. Its "No!" which was responsible for the greatest split between the churches of the Reformation, stands as it was spoken; the Reformed doctrine is openly silenced as in the dogmatics of Aulen or openly attacked as wrong and harmful. A new interconfessional polemics or "eristics," as Emil Brunner calls it, is developing and the same *furor theologicus* which made Melanchthon wish for death.

The divisive influence of a confessional theology has become obvious recently in a split in the Barthian groups which in the last analysis is due to a difference between a modern Lutheran and an old Calvinistic conception of faith. In Germany the modern Lutheran theology was developing into a nationalistic theology strongly influenced by Lutheran tendencies. It could be characterised as a Theology of Creation, taking such elements of creation as the blood, the race, the state, as God-given elements on which the nation, the church, and theology have to build. It was most characteristic that a statement of the Lutheran faculty of Erlangen and other statements coming from Lutheran theologians like Hirsch, Wobbermin, and theologians in Leipzig came very near to such a Theology of Creation, which was criticized by Karl Barth from his Reformed point of view as a mere natural theology having lost any distinctive features of the original Protestant faith. Karl Barth opposed to it a rigid theology of revelation and of the Word of God, falling back on the original distinctive elements in Calvin's theology. In spite of this tension between Lutheran and Reformed theology, Karl Barth's Reformed position had such a visible influence on certain groups within the Lutheran church that one spoke of the danger of a Calvinisation of the Lutheran Church.

4. LUTHERANS AND CALVINISTS IN THE GERMAN REVOLUTION

The present German situation is illuminating. When the German revolution broke out, the totalitarian state aimed not only at a complete unification of the whole nation but also at a complete church union. German Protestantism consisted hitherto of twenty-eight national churches in the various provinces, beside which a number of Free Churches lived in relative liberty and independence. From the confessional point of view the Lutheran churches were in the majority. The Reformed churches were loosely held together in two Reformed associations; nevertheless the Reformed influence was very strong, especially in the Rhineland. The largest church, that of Prussia, was a united church, although the church union effected by Frederick William III was not so much a confessional as an administrative one. Lutherans and Reformed lived peacefully together under the roof of the same church government. This church union had as a result, however, the disappearance of many formerly Reformed parishes which were entirely amalgamated with the Lutheran parishes, so that it meant a great loss to the Reformed church. The genuine Lutheran churches in Germany were nevertheless profoundly dissatisfied with this church union and remained faithful to the *Augustana invariata*, repudiating any attempt at union with the Reformed bodies. To celebrate jointly the Holy Communion is repugnant to the original Lutheran consciousness. It happens that in the German Evangelical Church of the Augsburg and the Helvetic confessions in Galicia, Poland, when the Holy Communion is celebrated in the same parish jointly, the elements are offered to the respective members of the parish according to their special rite. The Lutheran pastor, for instance, distributes the Holy Communion in the same service to both the Reformed and the Lutheran members of his parish, and the elements, the Lutheran wafer and the Reformed bread, are lying peacefully together on the same plate as if there never had been a Marburg Colloquy. The Lutheran receives the wafer kneeling before the pastor who puts the wafer on his tongue, while the Reformed stands upright and takes the bread himself from the plate. The same mode of partaking of the Holy Communion was practiced in the German Church of Hesse, where since ancient times similar union tendencies have remained alive.

Not only dogmatics but also church politics had hampered

the relationship between Lutherans and Reformed in Germany, especially when owing to the Reformed opposition from the Rhineland, the Evangelical Church of Prussia was prevented from introducing an episcopal government into the church.

When the German revolution broke out, the church ideal of the leading national socialists was one united evangelical and national church. This ideal was based on the fact that the church people had a different consciousness of confessional differences than the theologians. A man in the street does not feel himself as a Lutheran or a Reformed, but simply as an evangelical or as a Protestant. The unification of the church should have been a contribution to the unification of the totalitarian state. A certain group went even so far as to dream of one national Christian church combining the Catholic and the evangelical bodies. Nobody outside this group who knew the historic differences took the proposition seriously.

What would have been possible was a church union growing out of the existing church federation with a recognition of the historic confessions of faith. The church union in Prussia as well as the church in Württemberg could have been considered as a preliminary realization of this church ideal.

But the awakening denominational consciousness prohibited the realization of this possibility. General Superintendent Zoellner and other Lutherans aroused Lutheran opposition against any church union. The old Lutheran party with its center in Breslau which had refused to accept church union even for Prussia, together with this new Lutheran formation, considered the United Prussian Church a lamentable example of church union and made it a special target for their attacks. Nevertheless, a joint preliminary ministry worked out a plan for an establishment of one evangelical church in Germany under Lutheran leadership but including Lutherans and Reformed; but even such a plan was denounced as the ruin of Lutheranism by men like Professor Sasse in Erlangen. The Lutheran opposition to any church union made it necessary also for the Reformed bodies in Germany to come closer together. The result was a strengthening of the confessional consciousness in a struggle where all the evangelical forces should have formed one united Christian front against the attempt of the state to bring the church again under its full control.

We cannot describe here all phases of the political struggle within the German church and have to confine ourselves to the

development of the confessional aspect. We have shown that a certain affinity existed between the national socialistic theology represented by men like Hirsch, Gogarten, Beyer, Stapel, and the Lutheran theology of the "*Schöpfungsordnungen*," "the orders of creation," where the blood, the race, the state, are interpreted as God-given elements of the world order. A similar affinity prevailed in the relationship of the Lutherans with the episcopal church government. A group of Lutheran churches already possessed bishops, as for instance in Saxony. With the leadership idea dominating the German mind it became quite natural to put the German church under a Lutheran bishop and to invest him with unusual power. He has, according to the new church law, not only executive but even legislative powers; but here the Reformed opposition was inexorable. "No bishop!" has always been the slogan of the Reformed bodies. In spite of the fact that the Reformed Church in Hungary lives under an episcopal system which had not hitherto menaced church liberty in the least, the German bishop became once more as in Scotland the target of all Reformed attacks. When Bishop Müller became elected as *Reichsbischof* for the whole Evangelical German Church, the Reformed made it clear through their spokesman, the Rev. Mr. Hesse, that they would not accept him in his episcopal function, but only as the representative of the whole church in administrative matters. The question of the bishop became nearly a kind of shibboleth between the Lutherans and the Reformed.

It was once more evident that Lutheranism was not only more conservative in regard to social problems and more open to a natural theology based on "the orders of creation," but also was much more menaced with the danger of sacrificing its independence to the totalitarian claims of the state. The close relationship between church and state was hailed enthusiastically by Lutherans as a form of social responsibility with less restriction and reservations than in the Reformed church, which stood not only for theological continuity but also for an unrestricted liberty of the church in all spiritual affairs and for a thorough discrimination between the state and its temporal power in the one side and the church and its spiritual rights on the other. With the fact that Karl Barth became a widely acknowledged leader of the opposition not only within the Reformed circles but for the whole church standing for the continuity of the Reformation, the Reformed opposition

became so to speak the strongest bulwark of the opposition against state control and the ultimate and absolute theological defender of the inner liberty of the evangelical church. The Reformed theology having stood historically for independence and democratic organization of the church was thus enabled to render a real service to the whole evangelical church struggling for the soundness and the liberty of the church, menaced with the authority of the state and a nationalistic state theology.

Hence the Reformed church in Germany holds a strategic position in the present struggle for the liberty of the church and purity of doctrine. On three fronts the general evangelical opposition is guided by Reformed principles: 1. In the defense of the principle of the sovereignty of God, which excludes any coordinated principle as a basis for the confession of faith, such as the official theology offers in creative nature or in history considered as a creative power. Karl Barth, a Reformed theologian, has thus become a *defensor fidei* for the evangelical Lutherans as well as for the Reformed, while the leading Lutheran theologians like Hirsch, Gogarten, Althaus, Mandel, Stapel, Schomerus and others could not entirely resist the temptation to adapt the Gospel to the claims of the natural theology of the time and tried to find a synthesis between the message of the Gospel and the claims of nature or history.

2. The genuine Reformed opposition against the bishop has been profoundly justified in view of the abuse of power practiced by the nationalistic bishops who used illegal force to impose their doctrine on the pastors and the parishes. The inconsiderate introduction of the bishop into the church by episcopalian Lutherans against the warning of the Reformed church has proved to be an application of the political leadership-idea to the church and led rapidly to an open revolt and to a discrediting of the episcopal Constitution. The Reformed synodical system has therefore gained new ground even in the united and Lutheran circles, especially among the Rhineland fraternities of pastors.

3. With the entering of the parishes into the struggle for the liberty of the church, the Reformed conception of the congregation as constituting the fundamental unit of the church is emphasized as it never was by the Lutherans. The Reformed idea of the parish shapes a new type of church consciousness and awakens a parochial democratic spirit, in the opposition to an imposed authority. The destiny of the evan-

gelical church in Germany depends partly, from the theological point of view, on the victory of the doctrine of the sovereignty of God, and from the constitutional point of view, on the resistance of the parishes against an irresponsible church government. Both these positions are genuinely Reformed.

A new phase of the development begins with the national Synod which was held at Barmen, May 29-31, 1934. It became clear at this Synod that the former denominational differences between the Lutherans and the Reformed were of minor importance compared with the large amount of consensus which had approved during the common struggle for the liberty of the church and the purity of doctrine. It is a remarkable fact that the *Junge Kirche* declared in its issue No. 10 (1934), that the confessional differences between the two bodies would no more provoke a schism in the German church. This does not mean a united church as advocated by the German Christians, who see the basis of their unity not in a confession of faith but in the nation and the race.

The Synod of Barmen, where Lutherans and Reformed issued a common statement, prepared a basis broad enough to allow both groups to take their stand on the declaration that the Bible is the sole source of authority, that Christ is the sole Lord of the church, that the church repudiates the totalitarian claim of the state, and that political and religious aims should not be confounded. The historic discrimination between the Lutherans and the Reformed is not touched upon in this article, but a way is opened toward a deeper common heritage, the authority of the Bible, the sovereignty of God, the exclusive salvation by grace, and the universal priesthood of believers; the historic discriminating articles are provisionally not mentioned, so that joint communion is not excluded in principle.

This is a remarkable step towards a consensus of the Lutheran and the Reformed groups. Such a consensus is going to be reached in the doctrine *de Ecclesia* which the present need made a common front possible. Even where separation prevails, the hope is expressed jointly that the Holy Ghost may lead the divided groups towards the unity of the Spirit and towards an interpretation of the Gospel and the sacraments based on a common understanding of the Bible. This common understanding of the nature of a true evangelical church has helped to prepare the common front both of the denominational-minded

Lutherans and Reformed against all tendencies to dissolve the confessional differences in an administratively united church.

The Pastors' Emergency Association refused to be identified with one or the other group and stated that by forming a common front neither the Lutherans nor the Reformed gave up their confessional status; they are thankful to Karl Barth for having stimulated afresh within the united church the denominational consciousness which does not exclude in essentials unity of faith and action. It is acknowledged even by Lutherans (*Junge Kirche*, p. 440) that Barth awoke again that serious reflection on the true nature of the church that made possible again a reconsideration of the Lutheran Confession of Faith.

The Synod of Barmen will remain epoch-making because never in history has the confessional consciousness found such a combination with the will for unity as here. Two "convents" were organized, both of which tried to give a better expression of what Lutheranism and the Reformed faith meant and yet did not enter into polemics with each other. The *Junge Kirche* observed however that neither the Lutheran nor the Reformed body could find a uniform definition of their confessional basis. The unity of a common spiritual front does not mean a homogeneous denominational organization or a confessional identity. Union will not come from fresh formulas of unity but from listening to the Spirit which breathes through the Scriptures, for neither the Lutheran nor the Reformed creeds are considered a final and absolute interpretation of Christianity.

AUGUSTINE OF HIPPO, SERVUS SERVORUM CHRISTI

R. PIERCE BEAVER

*The Evangelical Reformed Church of Oakley
Cincinnati, Ohio*

The age of Saint Augustine was for the episcopate of the West a period of training for future duties. Before the end of the fifth century, in almost every community the real leader, both in temporal and spiritual matters, was the bishop. During the next two centuries there came into being the medieval prelate, a prince in the church and in the state; but the foundations of his ecclesiastical and civil jurisdiction had already been laid by the early part of the fifth century. The African bishops shared with their colleagues of the other western provinces the same line of evolution, until it was interrupted, first by the Vandal invasion, and then by the Islamic conquest. However, by that time Augustine of Hippo, Alypius of Thagaste, the primate Aurelius of Carthage, and their fellow-bishops had made contributions of permanent value to the whole church, and they had created a noble standard of duty and conduct to be emulated by prelates of a later day.

The life of an African bishop of the early fifth century is fully illustrated in the career of Saint Augustine. One must remember, however, that Hippo was a comparatively important seaport, that the extent of the diocese was large in comparison with many others, and, above all, that its spiritual ruler was no ordinary bishop, but a teacher revered by the whole of Africa and "the Church beyond the sea." Although Saint Augustine's life is in many respects typical of that of the North African bishops, it is therefore more complex than that of the average and on a greater scale than that of the majority of his colleagues. Many of his occupations and problems would be scarcely known to the bishop of a small, poor, remote, inland diocese.

When Saint Augustine became sole bishop of Hippo Regius

in 396,¹ he became head of a diocese apparently large for North Africa,² where a see was usually a village or *fundus*.³ Seven hundred bishoprics are known to have existed there during the fourth century; and, even if there was a Donatist for every Catholic, this is an astounding figure for a province the size of Africa. The longest extent of Augustine's domain from the city was towards the south-east, a distance of about forty miles; in other directions the distance was generally about twenty-five miles, although in certain places considerably less.⁴ It had a numerous population, of which the rural inhabitants were more Punic than Roman,⁵ and the townsmen more Latin than Punic-speaking.⁶ The majority of the Christians were then Donatists.⁷ The Catholics were given to pagan observances, sometimes under Christian forms,⁸ and to the grievous sins of "rioting and drunkenness," "strife and envying," and deception.⁹ The new bishop attacked these evils, endeavored to elevate the plane of religious and moral life, combated heresy and schism, and for thirty-four years lived a life without leisure, a "*servus servorum Christi*," as he proudly calls himself.¹⁰ Early in his presbyterate he wrote to a correspondent:¹¹ "For I do not propose to spend my time in the empty enjoyment of ecclesiastical dignity; but I propose to act as mindful of this, that to the one chief Shepherd I must give account of the sheep committed to me." This continued to be his attitude during the years of his long episcopate. Again and again he refers to the increasing

1 Presbyter, 391; bishop-coadjutor, 394.

2 In *Ep.* 34:5, (*CSEL.*, v. 34 (2), p. 26; Saint Augustine indicates the usual size of a diocese by using town—*civitas*—as synonymous with diocese.

3 *Gesta Collat. Carth.*, die I, cap. 181, (Mansi, IV, pp. 24, 136); Ferrère, F., *La situation religieuse de l'Afrique romaine depuis la fin du IV^e siècle jusqu'à l'invasion des Vandales*, pp. 14-16; Baxter, J. H., *Select Letters of Saint Augustine*, p. xxxi.

4 On the territory of Hippo, refer to: Mesnage, *L'Afrique Chrét.*, pp. 265-6; Leclercq, in *Dict.d' arch. chrét.*, v. 6 (2), art. "Hippone"; Dennis, *Hippo Regius*, p. 31.

5 *Ep.* 66:2; 84:2; 209:3, (*CSEL.*, v. 34 (2), pp. 236, 393; v. 57, p. 348).

6 *Serm.* 167:4, (*PL.*, v. 38, p. 910); Augustine relates a Punic proverb in Latin because "you all do not understand Punic."

7 *Ep.* 93:17, (*CSEL.*, v. 34, (2), p. 461-2); *Contra Litt. Petil.*, II, 83:184, (*PL.*, v. 43, p. 316).

8 7. *Ep.* 22; 29, (*CSEL.*, v. 34 (1), pp. 54 ff.; 114. ff.).

9 8. *Ep.* 22, (*CSEL.*, v. 34 (1), pp. 54-62).

10 *Ep.* 217, salutation; *Augustinus Episcopus Servus Christi et per Ipsum Servus Servorum Ipsius.* (*CSEL.*, v. 57, p. 403). *Ep.* 130, Salutation, *Augustinus Episcopus Servus Christi Servorumque Christi.* (v. 44, p. 40).

11 *Ep.* 23:6 (*CSEL.*, v. 34 (1), p. 70).

burden¹² of the bishop's office, the multifarious cares and tasks¹³ which occupied his day and those "hours which bishops devote to study while other men sleep."¹⁴ Moreover, throughout this entire period he suffered from illness.¹⁵

The bishop of Hippo was the superior of a considerable body of clergy, but it is impossible to determine their number. In the city of Hippo there were, besides the Donatist cathedral,¹⁶ five churches:¹⁷ three *basilicae*, the cathedral or *basilica pacis*,¹⁸ the *basilica Leontiana*,¹⁹ the *basilica ad octo martyres*,²⁰ and two chapels, one dedicated *ad viginti martyres*²¹ and the other to Saint Theogenes.²² The cathedral also had a chapel in honor of Saint Stephen, especially built by Augustine for the reception of relics of the Protomartyr.²³ All the clergy who ministered in these churches must have been present in the cathedral on September 26, 426, when Saint Augustine designated his successor; and it is recorded that there were then present the presbyters Saturnius, Leporius, Barnabas, Fortunatianus, Rusticus, Lazarus, and Eraclius.²⁴ Rusticus was the chaplain of the nunnery of Hippo.²⁵ This is too large a number of priests for the town, since the bishop performed most of the priestly duties, but it seems too small to include all the priests of the diocese. The lesser clerics present were grouped together as "clergy," and

12 "*Qui episcopalem sarcinam Hippone sustineo.*" *Ep.* 86, (*CSEL.*, v. 34 (2), p. 396); Cf. *Serm.* 339:1, (*PL.*, v. 38, p. 1480).

13 *Ep.* 31:4; 98:8; 102:1; 139:3; 151:13; 169:1, 13; 213:5; (*CSEL.*, v. 34 (2), p. 4; pp. 530; 545; v. 44, pp. 153; 392; 611; v. 57, pp. 366-7).

14 *Ep.* 118:3, (*CSEL.*, v. 34 (2), p. 668; "*O rem dignam vigiliis et lucubrationibus episcoporum*").

15 *Ep.* 10:1; 38:1; 118:43; 122:1; 229:1; (*CSEL.*, v. 34 (1), p. 23; v. 34 (2), pp. 64; 698; 742; v. 57, p. 497).

16 *Ep.* 29:11, (*CSEL.*, v. 34 (1), p. 121).

17 For the Christian archaeology of Hippo refer to Leclercq, art. "Hippone," in *Dict. d'arch. Chrét.*, v. 6 (2), p. 2483-2531; Leclercq, *L'Afrique Chrét.*, II, pp. 30-32; Gsell, *Les Monuments antiques de l'Algérie*, II, pp. 212-14).

18 *Ep.* 213, (*CSEL.*, v. 57, p. 373); *De Civ. Dei*, xxii, 8.

19 *Ep.* 29, (*CSEL.*, v. 34 (1), pp. 114 ff.) relates events which occurred in this church. *Serm.* 260; 262, (*PL.*, v. 38, pp. 1201; 1207).

20 *Serm.* 356:10, (*PL.*, v. 39, p. 1578).

21 *Serm.* 148; 325, (*PL.*, v. 38, pp. 799; 1447); *De Civ. Dei*, xxii, 8.

22 *Serm.* 273:7, (*PL.*, v. 38, p. 1251).

23 *Ep.* 212, (*CSEL.*, v. 57, p. 372); *De Civ. Dei*, xxii, 8. Saint Augustine built only when he believed it necessary. Possidius relates: "For new buildings he never had any desire, avoiding the entanglements of his soul in these things, since he wished always to have it free from all temporal annoyance." (*Vita Aug.*, 24).

24 *Ep.* 213:1, (*CSEL.*, v. 57, p. 373).

25 *Ep.* 210, salutation; 211:4, (*CSEL.*, v. 57, pp. 353, 359).

their number is not given. They probably were many times the number of priests. There was no parochial system in the town, since only the great capital of Carthage with its twenty-two churches had developed to this point, and was divided into seven parishes, each with a distinct body of clergy.²⁶ In the *Letters* and other writings of Saint Augustine there are occasionally mentioned priests, deacons, subdeacons, readers, and acolytes belonging to various parishes or stations in the diocese.²⁷ The institution and growth of monasticism in North Africa were fostered by the bishop Hippo, and, indeed, he is to be considered the founder of African communal life.²⁸ In the diocese of Hippo there were four monasteries of men, and perhaps two, certainly one, houses of women.²⁹ When he succeeded Bishop Valerius, Augustine established a community in the episcopal house, and there he lived frugally with his clergy.³⁰ Over the government of these communities the bishop kept the strictest supervision, although he never visited the nunneries unless it was unavoidable.³¹

26 Leclercq, *L'Afr. Chrét.*, v. II, p. 23.

27 The *Letters* mention the villages or towns of Asna, Gippe, Thiava, Spana, Subsana, and Urgi, each having one priest. *Ep.*, 29:12; 65:1; 83; 35:2; 62; 63; 105:3, (*CSEL.*, v. 34 (1), p. 122; v. 34 (2), pp. 233; 388 ff.; 28; 224 ff.; 226 ff.; 597); Fussala apparently had several priests, and for a time became a diocese. *Ep.* 209:2; 224:1, (*CSEL.*, v. 57, pp. 348; 451). Subsana apparently had three dependent chapels or missions, Turres, Ciza, and Verbalis. *Ep.* 63:4, (v. 34 (2), p. 228). There was also an episcopal see of Turres in Numidia, but it cannot be the place mentioned here. The great estates were frequently separate parishes, and *fundi* and *villae* mentioned are Mappalia, Strabonianensis, Victoriana, and Germaniciana. *Ep.* 66; 65; 105:3; 251, (*CSEL.*, v. 34 (2), pp. 234-6; 232 ff.; 597; 599). Various presbyters clearly belonging to the diocese of Hippo are named, but their stations are not revealed. *Ep.* 77; 78; 269, (*CSEL.*, v. 34 (2), pp. 329-30; 331 ff.; v. 57, p. 654). Three deacons of the town of Hippo are noticed. *Ep.* 77; 78; (*CSEL.*, v. 34 (2) pp. 329-30; 331 ff.; esp. 342). Timotheus was a reader of Subsana. *Ep.* 62; 63, (*CSEL.*, v. 34 (2); pp. 224 ff; 226 ff). There is recorded a sub-deacon of Spana. *Ep.* 35:2, 4, (*CSEL.*, v. 34 (2), pp. 28, 30). The acolyte Albinus several times carried letters. *Ep.* 191; 192; 193, (*CSEL.*, v. 57, pp. 163, 166, 168). Mesnage, *L'Afr. Chrét.*, p. 226-7, lists eighteen places belonging to Hippo. See also: Leclercq, *L'Afr. Chrét.*, II, pp. 30-32; Leclercq, art. "Hippone," *Dict. d'arch. Chrét.*, v. 6 (2), pp. 2483 ff.; Gsell, *Les Monuments antiques de l'Algérie*, II, p. 214.

28 Augustine established the first monastery in North Africa on his own lands at Thagaste and endowed it with a portion of his patrimony. *Confessions*, IX, 8:17; Possidius, *Vita S. Augustini*, 3, *Ep.* 126:7 (*CSEL.*, v. 44, p. 12-13).

29 The four houses for men were the monastery which he established in 391, the episcopal house, and two outside the city. (See *Serm.* 355, 1, 2; Possidius, *Vita*, 5; *Serm.*, 355, 2; *Serm.*, 356, 10, 15. For women there was a nunnery within the city (*Ep.* 210, 211;) and perhaps one nunnery outside (*Ep.* 35:2).

30 Possidius, *Vita Aug.*, 22.

31 *Ibid.*, 26.

Soon after his ordination as presbyter, Saint Augustine described the priest as one *qui populo ministrat sacramentum et verbum dei*,³² and when he became bishop one of his chief duties remained the ministry of the sacraments and the word. The episcopate, increasingly burdened with administrative and supervisory obligations during three centuries, had not yet been able to relieve itself to any great extent in Africa of the parochial duties of the first monarchical bishops. Services in the church were frequent. Daily communion was the practice in Africa, and Saint Augustine conformed to it.³³ In addition to this and to other services on Sunday and saints' days, there were evening services daily in the church of Hippo.³⁴ Moreover, the hearing of confession, the granting of absolution, the imposition of penance—or at least the responsibility for it—devolved upon the bishop; for the Council of Hippo (393) had decreed that priests might not absolve without the consent of the bishop, unless he was absent and it was a case of necessity.³⁵ If the offense was a matter of common knowledge, the absolution was to be public, the penitent receiving the imposition of hands before the "apsis." In many small African dioceses this may have been accomplished without unduly oppressing the bishop, but in a diocese such as Augustine's it must have been necessary to consider all cases in the parish churches "cases of necessity," and to have granted this power to the priests. The bishop was not even free from ordinary pastoral visitation, but in this Augustine "adhered to the rule set forth by the Apostle, and visited only the widows and orphans in their afflictions." Yet whenever it happened that he was requested by the sick "to come in person and pray to the Lord for them and lay his hand upon them, he went without delay."³⁶ The *vincula* of marriage were likewise fastened by the bishop.³⁷

However, more exacting even than the ministry of the sacraments was that of the word, especially preaching. Fortunately, this was an occupation dear to Saint Augustine, and

32 *Ep.* 21:3, (*CSEL.*, v. 34 (1), p. 51).

33 *De Serm. Dom. in Monte*, 116:26. (*PL.*, v. 34, p. 1280).

34 *Ep.* 29:11, (*CSEL.*, v. 34 (1), p. 122).

35 Council of Hippo, 393, *Ser.*, II, *can.* 30, (Mansi v. III, pp. 849, 924). Augustine mentions the long line of offenders waiting for the imposition of his hands. *Serm.*, 232, 8. (*PL.*, v. 38, p. 1111).

36 Possidius, *Vita Aug.*, 27.

37 *Enar. in Ps.*, 149:15, (*PL.*, v. 37, p. 1958).

one in which he was unsurpassed by contemporaries. Up to the time when he was ordained priest at Hippo, it had been the rule that no presbyter might preach in the presence of the bishop; but the Greek Bishop Valerius, who preached in Latin with difficulty, and who was acquainted with the eastern tradition, appointed him cathedral preacher.³⁸ This was a precedent soon followed by others, first Alypius of Thagaste, then Aurelius of Carthage, the primate of Africa.³⁹ As pleasing and natural as preaching was to the former teacher of rhetoric, the bishop did not take his task lightly. The care he devoted to it is revealed in his *De Doctrina Christiana*,⁴⁰ and the large number of sermons⁴¹ which have come down to us indicate the important place of this occupation in his program.

In addition to preaching there was teaching as another form of the ministry of the word. "Forenoon and afternoon alike"⁴² people sought the bishop, asking all manner of things including instruction; and inquiries came by letter from outlying portions of the diocese and from far distant places. The pressure of episcopal affairs notwithstanding, Saint Augustine freely gave attention to their enlightenment.⁴³ He was responsible also for the instruction of the catechumens, although much of the actual teaching was the task of priests and deacons.⁴⁴ At Carthage, *circa* 400, the deacon Deogratias was in charge of the catechumens, and for his benefit Saint Augustine systematized his principles and views in the teacher's manual *De catechizandis rudibus*.⁴⁵ Occasionally also one who had been judged erroneous or heretical came to Hippo for correction. For example Leporius, a monk who had been con-

38 *Ep.*, 29:7, (v. 34 (1), p. 118); Possidius, *Vita Aug.*, 5.

39 *Ep.* 41:1, (*CSEL.*, v. 34 (2), pp. 81-2); Possidius, *Vita Aug.*, 5.

40 Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, v. 34.

41 Three hundred sixty-three authentic *Sermones ad populum*, *PL.*, vols. 38, 39; Two hundred nine *Enarrationes in Psalmis*, *PL.*, vols. 36, 37; and one hundred thirty-eight sermons discovered since the publication of *The Sermons* by the Benedictines of St. Maur; Morin, *Sancti Augustini Sermones post Maurinos reperti*, vol. I, in *Miscellanea Agostiniana*. Cf. Bardenhewer, *Gesch. der Altkirch. Lit.*, IV. pp. 493 ff.

42 *Ep.* 213:5, (*CSEL.*, v. 57, p. 377).

43 Augustine even offered unsolicited to assist a young girl in her studies, and encouraged her to apply herself to the Scriptures (*Ep.* 226). For typical requests and replies, see *Ep.* 37, 92, 121, 140, 147-9, 158-9, 161-4, 169, 198-9, 213, 264-5.

44 *Serm.* 212; 213; 214; 215. (*PL.*, v. 38).

45 *PL.*, v. 40, pp. 309 ff.

demned by some bishops of Gaul for his views on the incarnation, came to Augustine for instruction, recanted, and atoned for his error. When his instructor believed that he was firmly grounded in the Catholic faith, he wrote to the Bishops Procopius and Cylinnius, and asked them to receive Leporius again.⁴⁶

Moreover, Saint Augustine's flock often sought spiritual and practical advice from their bishop rather than from the priests. Sometimes the problems resulted from the daily social contact with pagans and paganism, as in the case of Publicola.⁴⁷ The consecrated virgin Felicia was gently exhorted to persevere in the good life, and consoled for the existence of bad shepherds and sheep along with the good.⁴⁸ Ecdicia, an over-zealous ascetic, who had at length driven her husband into adultery, wrote to her bishop for consolation, and must have been surprised at the homily on wifely conduct which she received in reply.⁴⁹ But it is very rarely that the people of the diocese wrote to their bishop; they came in person. However in addition to being pastor of the church of Hippo, Saint Augustine stood as spiritual advisor to the bishops of Africa and other sections of the church and to many of the nobility and high officials. This required a voluminous correspondence.⁵⁰

The magnitude of these parochial duties would appear to furnish occupation enough for one man, but in addition Saint Augustine had the still greater responsibility of purely episcopal functions. The recruiting, training, maintenance, supervision, and discipline of the clergy called for a prodigious amount of work on the part of the bishop. Recruits were from the Roman rather than the indigenous stock, for the clerics in the regions outside of the town were handicapped in their ministrations by a lack of knowledge of Punic, and Augustine had to refuse the request of Bishop Novatus of Sitifis for his own brother, Lucil-

⁴⁶ *Ep.* 219, (*CSEL.*, v. 57, pp. 428 ff.).

⁴⁷ *Ep.* 46, 47, (*CSEL.*, v. 34, (2), pp. 123 ff.; 129 ff.).

⁴⁸ *Ep.* 208, (*CSEL.*, v. 57, pp. 342 ff.).

⁴⁹ *Ep.* 262, (*CSEL.*, v. 57, pp. 621 ff.).

⁵⁰ Paulinus of Nola and his wife Therasia (*Ep.* 25, 27, 30, 31, 42, 45, 80, 84, 95, 186); Saint Jerome's friends, Proba, Juliana, and Demetrias (*Ep.* 128, 129, 133, 188); the imperial ambassador Darius (*Ep.* 231); the proconsul Largus (*Ep.* 203); the tribune and commissioner Marcellinus (*Ep.* 128, 129, 133, 136, 138); and Count Boniface (*Ep.* 189, 220).

lus, a deacon, because of his proficiency in that language.⁵¹ The bishop of Hippo was insistent upon a trained clergy, and it is apparent that the episcopal monastery, where the clergy of the city lived in community, was also a seminary.⁵² Unfortunately for the diocese of Hippo, however, the men trained there were in demand throughout Africa, and were called away to important positions. It is believed that at least twelve bishops had been trained there.⁵³ The library of this school must have been one of the things which gave the bishop joy, and which received his constant oversight.⁵⁴ Ordination was, of course, reserved to the bishop alone, and candidates were ordained only after sufficient testimony concerning character and ability was brought forth by the people.⁵⁵ However, the congregation sometimes imposed upon the bishop's rights in this, as will be discussed later.⁵⁶ To clerics or laymen going to settle in another place, or travelling abroad, the bishop issued letters of commendation.⁵⁷

The administration of ecclesiastical justice had resulted in the establishment of bishop's courts. The ceremony and procedure of Bishop Augustine's court are not revealed in the letters and other writings, although he mentions it as an accepted institution;⁵⁸ but a number of cases upon which he passed judgment are recorded. The bishop's conduct towards ecclesiastical

51 *Ep.* 84, (*CSEL.*, v. 34, (2), pp. 392-393). The reading in section 2 (p. 393) is *cum Latina lingua*, but from the context it is evident that this is the error of a copyist who substituted *Latina* for *Punica*, or that the word is a gloss which has become incorporated in the text. Augustine occasionally refers to the Punic language. See *Ep.* 17:2 (*CSEL.*, v. 34, (1), pp. 41-42), which refers to Numidia, or at least to the region about Madaura, as "a district in which the cradle of that language is still warm." The serfs of Mappalia in the diocese of Hippo understood only Punic. *Ep.*, 66:2, (*CSEL.*, v. 34, (2), p. 236). The inhabitants of the city itself were more Latin than the rural residents; and in *Serm.* 167:4. (*PL.*, v. 38, p. 910) he states that not all of his hearers understand the Punic language.

52 A seminary was at once necessary to overcome the dearth of clergy, which was hindering the Church at the time of Augustine's consecration. *Vita*, 7, 11. To be of the greatest value to the church a clergyman had to have, besides spiritual and moral qualities, a certain education and be marked by "that finish of a man who has gone through the normal training." *Ep.* 60:1, (*CSEL.*, v. 34 (2), p. 221).

53 Sparrow-Simpson, *Letters of St. Aug.*, p. 302; Possidius, *Vita Aug.*, 11, states about ten.

54 *Ep.* 231:7, (*CSEL.*, v. 57, p. 510); *de Haeresibus*, 80.

55 Council of Hippo, 393, *Ser.*, II, *can.* 20 (Mansi, v. 3, pp. 849, 922).

56 Note the case of Pinianus, related below.

57 *Ep.* 78:4; 27:4-6; 31:7; 41:2; 159:1; 206; 212, (*CSEL.*, v. 34, (2), p. 337; v. 34 (1), pp. 99-102; v. 34, (2) pp. 6-7; 83-4; v. 44, pp. 497-8; v. 57, pp. 340; 371-2).

58 *Ep.* 133:2. (*CSEL.*, v. 44, p. 82).

offenders was canonically regulated. No cleric could be suspended from communion until he had actually been proven guilty, unless he failed to present himself for trial.⁵⁹ Priests, deacons, and lesser clerics were first judged by their bishop,⁶⁰ who reported his decision to the provincial Primate.⁶¹ If he desired, the condemned cleric might within a year⁶² appeal to six neighboring bishops to hear his case;⁶³ and from them he could appeal either to the provincial Primate and following that to the Council of all Africa, or directly to that body.⁶⁴ Cases concerning laity who were guilty of offenses against the church were disposed of by the bishop without the necessity of reporting, and there was apparently no such detailed provision for appeals as in the case of the clergy. Saint Augustine states that flogging was frequently used in episcopal courts to exact a confession, but does not state whether it was employed in the case of clerics as well as laymen.⁶⁵ Of all the sentences which the bishop might pronounce, that of excommunication was considered most severe. Saint Augustine regarded its imposition as a most serious responsibility, and therefore rarely employed it.⁶⁶ He wrote to Classicanus: "One thing I say deliberately as an unquestionable truth, that if any believer has been wrongfully excommunicated, the sentence will do harm rather to him who pronounces it than to him who suffers this wrong."⁶⁷

It is sufficient to mention one case which came before Augustine.⁶⁸ A priest accused a deacon of attempting to incite

59 *Ep.* 78:4, (*CSEL.*, v. 34, (2), p. 337). Council of Hippo 393, *Ser.*, II, *can.* 6 (Mansi III, p. 920).

60 *Ep.* 65, (*CSEL.*, v. 34 (2), p. 232); Ferrère, *op. cit.*, p. 29. At first it was necessary that the bishop call in five neighboring bishops to assist him in the trial of a priest, and two for the trial of a deacon, (Council of Hippo, 393, *Ser.*, II, *can.* 8; Mansi, III, p. 920), but by 402 the bishop alone tried the accused, and the first appeal was to neighboring bishops. *Ep.* 65; Sixteenth Council of Carthage, *can.* 17; *Cod. Can. Ecc. Afr.*, 125; (Mansi, III, p. 822).

61 *Ep.* 65:2, (*CSEL.*, v. 34 (2), pp. 233-4).

62 *Ibid.*

63 *Ibid.*

64 Sixteenth Council of Carthage, *can.* 17 (or *Cod. Can. Ecc. Afr.*, no. 125); Mansi, v. III, p. 822; Ferrère, p. 30; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, II, p. 106; *History of Councils*, II, p. 461.

65 *Ep.* 133:2, (*CSEL.*, v. 44, p. 82). Priests were not liable to torture in secular courts. *Cod. Theod.*, XI, 39, 10.

66 *Ep.* 250; (*CSEL.*, v. 57, pp. 593 ff); a sentence of excommunication of this period is preserved in a letter (58) of Synesius of Ptolemais. Kidd, *Documents Illustrative of Early Church History*, v. II, p. 156.

67 *Ep.* 250A, (*CSEL.*, v. 57, pp. 598-599).

68 For another example see *Ep.* 165.

him to immorality, and the deacon replied with a counter charge.⁶⁹ There was no evidence, but Saint Augustine knew the two men well, and suspected that the deacon had made a false charge.⁷⁰ Upon his refusal to raise the deacon to the priesthood, this man wrathfully declared that the priest Boniface should not be allowed to retain his office, at least as long as he was under suspicion. Thereupon he stirred up the laity, who demanded the dismissal of the priest.⁷¹ Boniface humbly agreed to refrain from the execution of his duties until he was cleared. Some of the Catholics of Hippo had been pointing with disdain at a few instances of scandal within the Donatist ranks, and had boasted that such things never occurred under Augustine's discipline. They were now quite perturbed.⁷² The bishop wrote a letter to the people of Hippo to be read in the church,⁷³ in which he refused to erase the name of Boniface from the roll of presbyters, because that was unjust and because it was contrary to the decree prohibiting suspension before conviction.⁷⁴ Moreover, he could not now give judgment since he had passed the case on to a higher judge, in fact to the Supreme Judge; he had left the matter to God to decide by direct intervention. The⁷⁵ priest and deacon had been sent together to the tomb of Saint Felix of Nola, where Augustine expected the guilt of one and the innocence of the other to be made manifest in some miraculous way.⁷⁶ The shrine of Saint Felix had some reputation for such miracles, and an authentic account of whatever occurred could not be obtained from Paulinus. Unfortunately there is no report of the outcome.

The majority of cases, however, which came to the bishop's court were not strictly ecclesiastical, but civil; the *audientia episcopalis*, arbitration was the most frequent judicial occupation of the diocesan ruler. Roman law had early allowed two litigants to settle their dispute by appeal to an arbitrator upon whom both agreed; and when this practice was employed by Christians, they had naturally turned to the bishops. It was

69 *Ep.* 77; 78. (*CSEL.*, v. 34 (2), pp. 329 ff.; 331 ff.).

70 *Ep.* 78:2, (p. 333).

71 *Ep.* 77:2; 78:2, (pp. 330; 333).

72 *Ep.* 78:8, (*CSEL.*, v. 34 (2), p. 342).

73 *Ep.* 78, (*CSEL.*, v. 34 (2), pp. 331-345).

74 *Ibid.*, 4, (pp. 336-7).

75 *Ibid.*, *Ep.* 77:2, (p. 330).

76 *Ibid.*, 3, (pp. 335-6).

thought to have been recommended to Christians by Saint Paul in I *Corinthians* 6:1. According to Sozomen, the Emperor Constantine made this appeal to the bishop legal.⁷⁷ It is said that an edict of 333 made the bishop's judgment binding if only one of the parties involved appealed⁷⁸ to him, but that this was later reduced to cases in which both parties appealed. Stilicho reduced this power of the prelates,⁷⁹ but on his death a new law was enacted⁸⁰ rendering an episcopal judgment not subject to appeal.⁸¹ As is at once apparent, this carried episcopal arbitration to the highest degree of authority.⁸² At the same time that this honored the bishops it placed a heavy burden upon them. Augustine was "daily saluted with lowly respect" by men "who are desirous of terminating through his help disputes concerning secular affairs"—"gold or silver or land or cattle."⁸³ Moreover, this service was asked even by heretics⁸⁴ and pagans.⁸⁵ Sometimes he had to devote the greater part of the day, especially following Easter,⁸⁶ to listening to the often selfish and greedy claims of his people.⁸⁷ His biographer states: "Though they sometimes kept him even until mealtime and sometimes he had even to fast all day, yet he always examined these cases and passed judgment upon them, considering in them the value of human souls,—in how far each had increased or decreased in faith and good works."⁸⁸ Often correspondence, with its consequent difficulty of finding means of communication, was neces-

77 Sozomēn, *Hist. Ecc.*, I, 9:5; cf. Boyd, *Ecc. Edicts of the Theod. Code*, p. 90.

78 Ayer, *Source Book of Early Church History*, p. 382; *Cod. Just.*, I, 4:7 and 8; Boyd, *Ecc. Edicts of the Theod. Code*, p. 92. Gratian recognized the rights of the church courts, (*Cod. Theod.*, XVI, 2:23) to hear ecclesiastical cases but required that criminal cases be judged by the secular courts. Honorius confirmed the jurisdiction of bishops over religious cases, ordered their deposition of priests to be enforced by police authority if necessary, and required all other cases to be heard according to law. (*Cod. Theod.*, XVI, 11:1; II, 35:41; *Const. Sirm.*, 7).

79 *Cod. Theod.*, XVI, 11:1.

80 *Ibid.*, I, 27:2; *Cod. Just.*, I, 4:8.

81 On a level with a judgment of the Praetorian Prefect.

82 Saint Augustine refers to "the law of the princes of this world who have deferred so much to the Church, that whatever is judged in the Church cannot be dissolved." *Enar. in Ps.*, 25:13, (*PL.*, v. 36, p. 196).

83 *Ep.* 33:5, (*CSEL.*, v. 34, (2), p. 22).

84 *Ep.* 43:2, (*CSEL.*, v. 34 (2), p. 86); Possidius, *Vita Aug.*, 19.

85 Possidius, *Vita Aug.*, 19: "Christians or by men of any sect."

86 *Serm.* 259:6, (*PL.*, v. 38, p. 1201).

87 *Ep.* 48:1, (*CSEL.*, v. 34, (2), p. 137); *Contra Duas Ep. Pel.*, 35:14, (*PL.*, v. 44, pp. 597-8); Possidius, *Vita Aug.*, 19.

88 Possidius, *Vita Aug.*, 19.

sary.⁸⁹ Although he faithfully discharged this duty, Saint Augustine appears to have disliked this occupation, for the person against whom a bishop decided was likely to show ill feeling and make unpleasant charges concerning the prelate's integrity;⁹⁰ and this work which took him away from the better things he regarded as a kind of conscription, for his pleasure was always in the things of God or in the exhortation or conversation of intimate brotherly friendship."⁹¹

A bishop was supposed to confine his authority and activities to his own diocese, and there he was to rule without interference.⁹² However, the bishop was sometimes coerced by his laity, or at least he often had to humor their fancies.⁹³ Saint Augustine rarely journeyed outside of his diocese, and did not undertake distant missions for the African church,⁹⁴ both because of his health and because his people would not permit him.⁹⁵ However, the irresponsibility shown by the clergy and people during times of his absence, was the strongest bond which tied him to the city.⁹⁶ The greatest interference with episcopal sovereignty was the violent thrusting of ordination upon an unwilling man at the hands of an unwilling bishop. It was thus that Saint Augustine had been made priest in Hippo,⁹⁷ and the people of the city tried to do this once again in the case of Pinianus.⁹⁸

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*

⁹⁰ *Enar. in Ps.*, 25:13, (*PL.*, v. 36, p. 196); Possidius, *Vita Aug.*, 19. The later states that Augustine kept in mind "the remark of a certain one who said that he preferred to hear cases between strangers rather than friends; for of strangers he could gain the one over as a friend in whose favor the case was justly decided, whereas he would lose one of his friends against whom judgment was passed."

⁹¹ Possidius, *Vita Aug.*, 19.

⁹² "In other towns we deal with matters concerning the Church only so far as the bishops of those towns, our brethren and fellow-priests, allow us or enjoin upon us." *Ep.* 34:5, (*CSEL.*, v. 34, (2), p. 26).

⁹³ As in the famous incident at Oea, which Augustine reports to Jerome, when the people refused to allow the bishop to introduce Jerome's new Latin version of the Bible. *Ep.* 71:5, (*CSEL.*, v. 34 (2), p. 253).

⁹⁴ On one occasion he acted as legate or commissary for Bishop Zosimus of Rome and journeyed to Caesarea in Mauretania. *Ep.* 190:1, (*CSEL.*, v. 57, pp. 137-8).

⁹⁵ *Ep.* 22:9; 124:2, (*CSEL.*, v. 34 (1), p. 62; v. 44, p. 2).

⁹⁶ *Ep.* 122; 124:2, (*CSEL.*, v. 34 (2), pp. 742-4; v. 44, p. 2).

⁹⁷ *Ep.* 21, (*CSEL.*, v. 34 (1), pp. 49-54; Possidius, *Vita Aug.*, 8. In this case the bishop was not unwilling.

⁹⁸ *Ep.* 125; 126, (*CSEL.*, v. 44, pp. 3 ff.; pp. 7 ff.).

Upon the capture of Rome by Alaric, many wealthy nobles fled to their estates in Africa, and among the richest were Albina, her daughter Melania, and son-in-law Pinianus, who settled at Thagaste.⁹⁹ There they presented to the church an estate of greater extent than the town.¹⁰⁰ Saint Augustine bade them welcome to Africa, excused himself from visiting them on account of age, health, and the requirements of his parishioners, and invited them to visit Hippo.¹⁰¹ Pinianus and Melania accepted the invitation, and came to Hippo accompanied by Bishop Alypius.¹⁰² Meanwhile their reputation for lavish giving became known in Hippo, for Melania had sold her estates in Gaul and Spain and distributed the money, and was now supporting many churches and monastic houses with the revenues of her Italian, Sicilian, and African properties.¹⁰³

Therefore a large congregation, determined to capture a rich prize, was present in the cathedral when Augustine received his guests. All the people shouted for Augustine to ordain Pinianus their priest at once.¹⁰⁴ The bishop had had some intimation of what might occur, and had promised his guest that he would not be ordained against his will.¹⁰⁵ He told the assembly that if they took Pinianus as their priest they would be without a bishop.¹⁰⁶ This only temporarily quieted them, and then the rioting became so turbulent that Augustine feared that homicide might result.¹⁰⁷ The mob then turned against Alypius and hurled insults at him, accusing him of preventing Pinianus from gratifying their wishes, in order that he might keep a rich man in his church. Rather than become a priest, Pinianus declared that he would leave Africa; but he finally agreed to take an oath that he would reside in Hippo, and that if he ever should

99 *Ep.* 124, (*CSEL.*, v. 44, pp. 1-2); Palladius, *Hist. Laus.*, 118, (*PL.*, v. 73, pp. 1200-1)

100 Baxter, *Sel. Letters of St. Aug.*, p. 218, n.; cites *Anal. Bolland.*, viii, 1889, p. 35.

101 *Ep.* 124, (*CSEL.*, v. 44, pp. 1-2).

102 *Ep.* 125; 126, (*CSEL.*, v. 44, pp. 3 ff.; pp. 7 ff.).

103 Palladius, *Hist. Laus.*, 119, (*PL.*, v. 73, pp. 1201-2); cf. McNabb, "Was the Rule of Saint Augustine Written for Saint Melania the Younger?" *Journal of Theological Studies*, v. XX, 1919, pp. 242-249.

104 *Ep.* 125:2; 126:1, (*CSEL.*, v. 44, pp. 4, 8).

105 *Ep.* 126:1, (p. 8).

106 *Ibid.*

107 *Ibid.*, 1, 2, (pp. 8-9).

receive ordination it would only be in Hippo.¹⁰⁸ Certain of success, the mob disbanded. However, when morning came, Pinianus and Melania departed to Thagaste. Albina and her family and the people of Thagaste were soon making accusations concerning the sordid motives of the congregation and perhaps even the bishop of Hippo.¹⁰⁹ Saint Augustine loyally defended his people against these charges, and, most surprising, he insisted that Pinianus keep his promise.¹¹⁰ The oath was exacted through fear and terrorization, but Augustine would not allow this.¹¹¹ He regarded it as a valid oath, and the breaking of it would involve the sin of perjury.¹¹² Moreover, unless the fulfillment of the oath was required by the two bishops involved, their own promises would no longer be credited.¹¹³ Pinianus did not return, and when he lost his fortune the people of Hippo dropped the matter.¹¹⁴ Melania and her husband became again on good terms with Saint Augustine, and after they went to Palestine referred theological problems to him.¹¹⁵

Temporal duties formed a third and exacting division of the bishop's occupations. The estates of the church of Hippo were extensive, more than twenty times the size of Saint Augustine's own patrimony,¹¹⁶ and consisted of both town houses¹¹⁷ and rural farmlands¹¹⁸ as well as funds in the church treasury.¹¹⁹ Even a ship has been offered, but was refused.¹²⁰ The administration of these possessions and revenues was a task unpleasant to Bishop Augustine, who said that "he preferred to

108 *Ibid.*, 3-5, (pp. 9-11).

109 *Ibid.*, 7-9; 125:2, (pp. 12-15; p. 3).

110 *Ep.* 125:3-4; 126:11-14, (*CSEL.*, v. 44, pp. 5-7; 16-18).

111 *Ep.* 126:1, (p. 8).

112 *Ep.* 125:3-4; 126:12, (pp. 5-7; 17).

113 *Ibid.*, 4, (pp. 6-7).

114 Baxter, *Sel. Let. of St. Aug.*, p. 223, n.

115 *Ep.* 202:2, (*CSEL.*, v. 57, p. 301); *De Gratia Christi* and *De Peccato Originali* answer their questions concerning certain statements of Pelagius.

116 *Ep.* 126:7, (*CSEL.*, v. 44, p. 13).

117 *Ep.* 99:1, 3, (*CSEL.*, v. 34, (2), pp. 533, 535).

118 *Ep.* 35:4, (*CSEL.*, v. 34, (2), p. 30); *Enar. in Ps.*, 103:3; 16, (*PL.* v. 37, p. 1371); Getty, *The Life of the N. Africans as Revealed in the Sermons of Saint Augustine*, p. 115.

119 *Ep.* 268:3, (*CSEL.*, v. 57, p. 654).

120 *Serm.*, 355:5, (*PL.*, v. 39, p. 1572); Getty, *Life of the N. Afr. as Rev. in the Serm. of St. Aug.*, pp. 130-1. Augustine did not desire to become involved in the obligations fastened upon the collegium of the *Navicularii* by the imperial government

live by the contributions of God's people rather than be burdened with the care and direction of these possessions, and that he was ready to give them back to them so that all the servants and ministers of God might live after the manner of which we read in the Old Testament, that they were partakers of that altar which they served. But this the laity were never willing to undertake."¹²¹ The Bishop had an assistant, chosen from among "the more capable clergy," who supervised this property and directed its exploitation.¹²² Clerical work was necessary for this as well as for many of the prelate's other occupations, and a corps of notaries and secretaries was maintained at Hippo.¹²³ A yearly audit of diocesan accounts was made.¹²⁴ The sources of this accumulating property were gifts,¹²⁵ legacies,¹²⁶ and probably a portion of the property relinquished by monks when they entered the monasteries of Hippo.¹²⁷ Saint Augustine had each bequest investigated to see that it would work no hardship on the family of the testator¹²⁸ and he sometimes refused to accept legacies.¹²⁹ Personal gifts were sent to the bishop, often in the form of costly robes,¹³⁰ but with few exceptions he refused to use them,¹³¹ had them sold, and placed the money in the charitable funds of the diocese.¹³²

121 Possidius, *Vita Aug.*, 23.

122 *Ibid.*, 24.

123 *Ep.*, 213:2, (*CSEL.*, v. 57, p. 375); Possidius, *Vita Aug.*, 24.

124 Possidius, *Vita Aug.*, 24.

125 *Ep.* 83:6, (*CSEL.*, v. 34, (2), pp. 391-2). Possidius (24) relates that one of the chief men of Hippo announced his intention to give his entire property to the church, retaining the interest until his death. The deed was presented to Augustine, who gladly accepted it. However, some years later the man sent his son with a letter asking the bishop to return the deed. One hundred gold pieces might be retained for the poor. Saint Augustine promptly returned the deed, spurned the gold, and wrote the man a letter of censure and reproof, warning him to make his peace with God in humble repentance for his false pretenses and wickedness, that he might not depart from this life under the burden of so great a sin.

126 The bishop urged men to remember Christ as well as their sons in their wills. *Serm.* 355:4, (*PL.* v. 39, p. 1571); Getty, *Life of the N. Africans as Rev. in the Serm. of St. Aug.*, pp. 127 ff.

127 The monks of Hippo had to assume poverty. If a priest possessed any property it was to pass to his church after his death. *Ep.* 83:4, (*CSEL.*, v. 34, (2), p. 390). Paragraph 6 of the same letter indicates that the diocesan and monastic treasuries were one and the same.

128 Possidius, *Vita Aug.*, 24.

129 *Serm.* 355:3, 4, 5, (*PL.*, 39, pp. 1570-2).

130 *Serm.* 161:10; *Enar. in Ps.*, 51:14, (*PL.*, v. 38, p. 883; v. 36, p. 609).

131 *Ep.* 263, (*CSEL.*, v. 57, p. 625).

132 *Serm.* 356:13, (*PL.*, v. 39, p. 1580).

The care of the poor ever required Augustine's attention, and he complained that when he was away from Hippo the church neglected its duty.¹³³ For this purpose he even drew from the funds intended for the maintenance of the clergy and bishop, occasionally to the dislike of those who were dependent on the funds.¹³⁴ Once when money was lacking and, besides the poor, there were many captives to be ransomed, he even went to the extreme of melting down the holy vessels.¹³⁵ The bishop, the father of the church, was designated by parents and magistrates as the guardian of the orphans.¹³⁶ Thus a dying father left his small daughter to Augustine's care.¹³⁷ A pagan, Rusticus, asked that the girl be given in marriage to his son, and made his request through the Catholic Bishop Benenatus, who apparently approved of the man and his wish. Augustine, however, was indignant. The girl was a Catholic, and must be kept where she will be a supporter of the true church. At present she was too young for marriage, as she was also too young to carry out her desire to take religious vows, a desire with which the bishop of Hippo naturally sympathized. At any rate the matter could not at all be considered until the young man became a Christian. In this respect Possidius relates that Augustine always followed a rule which he had learned from the practice of Ambrose: "namely, never to seek a wife for another man, nor to urge anyone who desired to go to war to do so, nor to accept an invitation to a feast in his own community."¹³⁸

Moreover, the intercession with government officials and secular courts on behalf of criminals was often a heavy and difficult burden.¹³⁹ Abuses of this episcopal interference led the Emperors Theodosius and Arcadius to forbid an appeal through the clergy after condemnation, excepting in those cases where the appeal was prompted by a sense of humanity or a failure of justice.¹⁴⁰ The bishops no doubt did accomplish much good,

133 *Ep.* 122, (*CSEL.*, v. 34 (2), pp. 742-4); cf. *Serm.* 339:3, (*PL.*, v. 39, p. 1481); Possidius, *Vita Aug.*, 24. Augustine preached on charity and sometimes made appeals for special offerings. See Getty, *Life of the N. Africans as Rev. in the Serm. of St. Aug.*, pp. 93-97, 114 ff.

134 Possidius, *Vita Aug.*, 23.

135 *Ibid.*, 24.

136 *Ep.* 252 to 255, (*CSEL.*, v. 57, pp. 600-603).

137 *Ibid.*

138 Possidius, *Vita Aug.*, 27.

139 *Ep.* 151: 2, (*CSEL.*, v. 44, p. 383); Possidius, *Vita Aug.*, 19.

140 *Cod. Theod.*, IX, 40:15, 16; Boyd, *Ecc. Edicts of the Theod. Code*, p. 98.

but so many of them granted the desire of every worthless fellow who requested their assistance, that they frequently obstructed justice and sadly embarrassed the civil authorities. Augustine seldom made use of this right,¹⁴¹ although he does refer to it as "a favor which we are accustomed to grant to all,"¹⁴² and therefore the instances when he did intercede were all the more effective.¹⁴³ The bishop and Macedonius, vicar of Africa, engaged in an interesting exchange of correspondence on this subject, debating the topic from the episcopal and magisterial viewpoint. The vicar's objections¹⁴⁴ impress one as just. It is a testimonial to the nobility of the bishop's character that he interceded for enemies of the Catholics, groups of pagans¹⁴⁵ and Donatists¹⁴⁶ who had been convicted of murder and other crimes against the people of the church. His intercession unfortunately failed in the judicial murder of his friends Apringius and Marcellinus.¹⁴⁷

Similar to this duty of intercession and often involving it was the bishop's obligation to those who claimed the church's right of sanctuary. It may have arisen out of the practice of persons fleeing to the bishop to ask his intercession with the civil authorities.¹⁴⁸ An edict of Theodosius I made it legal, but also limited it in the case of debtors, in which instance the bishop had to discharge the financial responsibility of the fugitive or turn him over to the officers or creditors seeking him.¹⁴⁹ Thus a certain Fascius, who owed seventeen solidi to the tax-collectors fled to Augustine's cathedral for sanctuary, and the bishop paid his creditors that amount.¹⁵⁰ Since he did not have that amount at hand, he borrowed the sum, and Fascius agreed to repay the man who lent it. However, he failed to do so by the prescribed time, and the bishop instructed the priests to read a letter¹⁵¹ to

141 Possidius, *Vita Aug.*, 20.

142 *Ep.* 151:2, (*CSEL.*, v. 44 p. 383).

143 Possidius, *Vita Aug.*, 20; *Ep.* 154:1, (*CSEL.*, v. 44, p. 428).

144 *Ep.* 151 to 155, (*CSEL.*, v. 44, pp. 382 ff.).

145 *Ep.* 90; 91; 103; 104:1, (*CSEL.*, v. 34, (2), pp. 426; 427 ff.; 578 ff.; 582).

146 *Ep.* 100; 133; 134; 139:2, (*CSEL.*, v. 34, (2), pp. 535 ff.; v. 44, pp. 80 ff.; 84 ff.; 144 ff.).

147 *Ep.* 151, (*CSEL.*, v. 44, pp. 382-392).

148 Canon 7 of the Council of Sardica states that aid shall not be denied those who flee to the church. Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, I, pp. 561-3; *Hist. of Councils*, II, pp. 137.

149 *Cod. Theod.*, IX, 45:1.

150 *Ep.* 268:1, (*CSEL.*, v. 57, p. 652).

151 *Ep.* 268, (*CSEL.*, v. 57, pp. 262-4).

the congregation asking a special offering for this purpose. If a sufficient sum was not raised, the remainder of the amount was to be drawn from the church treasury. It usually happened that after a few days the fugitive would become careless,¹⁵² and leave the church for lengthy periods, until he was suddenly waylaid and carried away to trial. Faventius, a tenant of one of the great estates of the region, had some reason to fear the proprietor, and fled to the church at Hippo, but after some days was captured through lack of vigilance and carried away to Cirta, the capital of Numidia.¹⁵³ The priest whom Augustine sent to intercept the party failed to secure his release, and the captive was imprisoned as soon as he arrived in the city. Saint Augustine employed his rights of intercession, wrote to the magistrate,¹⁵⁴ and also requested the bishop of Cirta to visit him personally.¹⁵⁵ The magistrate was a Christian with a good reputation, but, nevertheless, Augustine was apprehensive concerning the outcome of the trial since the proprietor was a very wealthy man. Classicanus,¹⁵⁶ mentioned above, was excommunicated by his bishop, Auxilius, because he objected to the grant of sanctuary to men who had broken an oath taken on the Gospels.¹⁵⁷

In the midst of all these obligations and occupations Saint Augustine in some remarkable manner found time to compose an entire library of writings.¹⁵⁸ Each bishop was responsible for the suppression of heresy and schism in his diocese, but Augustine's field was the whole church. His colleagues recognized his preeminence, which was to make him the greatest doctor of the church, and officially commissioned him to pursue his studies in Biblical exposition and theology.¹⁵⁹ To facilitate this by decreasing the pressure of administrative duties,¹⁶⁰ Saint Au-

152 A "usual occurrence." *Ep.* 115, (*CSEL.*, v. 34 (2), p. 661).

153 *Ep.* 113; 114; 115, (*CSEL.*, v. 34, (2), pp. 695 f.; 660 f.; 661 f.).

154 *Ep.* 116, (p. 663).

155 *Ep.* 115, (*CSEL.*, v. 34 (2), p. 662).

156 *Ep.* 250, (*CSEL.*, v. 57, pp. 593 ff).

157 Apparently regarded as the most sacred and binding of oaths.

158 He considered this recreation. *Ep.* 261:1, (*CSEL.*, v. 57, pp. 617-18).

159 *Ep.* 213:5, (*CSEL.*, v. 57, p. 377).

160 In 414 or 415 Saint Augustine wrote to a correspondent: "... in so far as leisure is granted me from the work imperatively demanded by the church, which my office especially binds me to serve, I have resolved to devote the time entirely, if the Lord is willing, to the labor of studies pertaining to ecclesiastical learning; in doing which, I think I may, if it please the mercy of God, be of some service even to future generations." *Ep.* 151:13 (*CSEL.*, v. 44, p. 392).

gustine tried three expedients. The first was the division of the diocese of Hippo, and apparently he could do this without referring the matter to a council or to his neighboring colleagues. He separated Fussala, a town forty miles away, to which he could no longer give adequate personal attention.¹⁶¹ However, Bishop Anthony, who was ordained to rule over this place failed in his duty, and was removed.¹⁶² Fussala reverted to Hippo.¹⁶³

Another scheme was an arrangement on the part of the people of Hippo that they allow their bishop five days a week free from their interference, in order that he might spend that time in study. This was soon disregarded.¹⁶⁴ A few years later, September 26, 426,¹⁶⁵ Saint Augustine tried a third plan, the appointment of an assistant. Valerius had made Augustine his coadjutor, and this expedient might have been available to the latter also, if he had not come to believe that this had been forbidden by the eighth canon of Nicaea, which forbade two bishops, meaning rivals, in one see.¹⁶⁶ In addition to the actual need for an assistant, he wished also to provide against any confusion and disturbance following his death. Severus of Milevis had lately appointed his successor,¹⁶⁷ but without consulting the laity, and for a time opposition had threatened his appointed successor. Augustine, therefore, desired that his choice should be ratified both by the clergy and congregation of the town. He called the people together in the Cathedral of Peace,¹⁶⁸ and a careful record of the proceedings was taken by the notaries of the church.¹⁶⁹ Augustine explained his act, and then presented the priest Eraclius as his successor.¹⁷⁰ The congregation shouted approval.¹⁷¹ In order not to expose Eraclius to the censure

161 *Ep.* 209:2, (*CSEL.*, v. 57, p. 348).

162 *Ep.* 209, (*CSEL.*, v. 57, pp. 347-353).

163 *Ep.* 224, (*CSEL.*, v. 57, p. 451) mentions a priest of Fussala under Augustine's jurisdiction.

164 *Ep.* 213:5, (*CSEL.*, v. 57, p. 375).

165 *Ibid.*, 1, (p. 373).

166 *Ibid.*, 4, (p. 376); Council of Nicaea, *can.* 8; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, I, pp. 391 ff.; *History of Councils*, I. pp. 407-9.

167 *Ibid.*, 1, (p. 374).

168 The cathedral was known as the *basilica pacis* or *basilica maior*.

169 *Ep.* 213:2, (p. 375).

170 *Ibid.*, 1, end; 2, (pp. 374, 375). Perhaps the same Eraclius who, as a deacon, built a chapel in honor of a martyr. *Serm.*, 356:7, 10, (*PL.*, v. 39, p. 1577).

171 *Ibid.*, 1-3, reported at the end of each section.

which he had incurred by being made bishop-coadjutor, his consecration would not take place until after Augustine's death.¹⁷² Again the people shouted approval. The bishop referred to his need of leisure for study, to the former agreement which had been violated, and announced that he would place the burden of the diocesan administration on Eraclius, who knew the bishop's usual practice in most cases, and who might refer to him when in doubt.¹⁷³ Eraclius was thus in the terminology of a later time arch-deacon with the right of succession to the episcopate. All present who were able were asked to subscribe their signatures to the record, and to again show their assent by acclamation. When silence was again obtained, the bishop closed the assembly, and asked the prayers of the people for the church, for himself, and for Eraclius.¹⁷⁴

Saint Augustine survived this agreement only four years; and these were unhappy years in which he saw the Catholic church of Africa fall to ruin under the invading Vandals.¹⁷⁵ The bishops appealed to Augustine for instructions concerning their behavior in the face of the foe,¹⁷⁶ and finally crowded into Hippo to enjoy his hospitality during the siege. In the third month of the siege Aurelius Augustine, *servus servorum Christi*, passed away, his last months spent not in the leisure he had craved, but still in the service of others.

172 *Ibid.*, 4, 5, (*CSEL.*, v. 57, pp. 276-7).

173 *Ibid.*, 6, (pp. 377-8).

174 *Ibid.*, 7, (p. 379).

175 Possidius, *Vita Aug.*, 28.

176 *Ep.*, 228, (*CSEL.*, v. 57, pp. 484-496).

CHURCH AND STATE IN SPAIN

By CHARLES S. BRADEN

Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois

With no other country save possibly Italy has the Roman Catholic Church been more closely linked than with Spain. To think Spain was to think Roman Catholicism. Ferdinand and Isabella whom the world remembers best in relation to the discovery of the western world were known as the Catholic kings and their oft expressed motive in the conquest of the new continent was that of extending the holy faith. Mohammedanism with its resistless armies had made heavy inroads upon the Christian world; Luther and his fellow reformers in Germany, France, and Switzerland had wrought still further havoc, separating vast numbers of the faithful from their allegiance to Rome. To Spain and the Spanish monarchs was to belong the glory of restoring, by their zealous conversion of the western peoples, the power and prestige of Rome. In a few short years Spanish conquerors followed by Spanish priests and nuns had planted the cross from Mexico to the southern end of South America.

The Inquisition did not originate in Spain, but there it had its fullest flowering. Functioning as an ecclesiastical court, it depended for the carrying out of its judgments upon the secular arm. And in no state was more hearty support given that tribunal than in Spain. To think of the Inquisition is to think of the Spanish Catholic expulsion of the Moors and the Jews. A Torquemada could flourish only with strong state cooperation. Beginning with the opening of the nineteenth century other nations one by one broke with the church, yet the Spanish dependencies as they gained their independence almost without exception wrote into their republican constitutions articles declaring Roman Catholicism to be the religion of the state, and forbidding the practice of any other. This was but an evidence of the intimacy of the relationship between Spanish peoples and the church. But as the nineteenth century wore on an increasing spirit of tolerance caused one after another of the

Spanish American republics either to separate church and state or at least to admit of a degree of tolerance unknown to Spain. The twentieth century has carried the process still further. We are most familiar with the recent struggle of the church and the state in Mexico, but it has not been limited to Mexico. By 1930 there remained only six out of twenty republics, and these the smaller, less powerful states, in which Catholicism continued to be regarded as the state church, and no country which did not tolerate other faiths. Yet Spain, until December 1931, recognized Roman Catholicism as the state religion and contributed largely to its support. The story of the long struggle which culminated in the decree of separation is a fascinating one. The coming of complete separation may have seemed sudden to those who had not kept in touch with Spanish affairs, but as a matter of fact it was by no means sudden. It was simply the logical conclusion of a century-long struggle, the fruition of the dreams of liberalism of more than a hundred years. It is the story of that struggle which this article attempts to tell.

The first serious opposition to the church was the result of the influence of French radical philosophy and skepticism near the beginning of the nineteenth century. Voltaire, particularly, was widely read and quite influential among the younger Spanish intellectuals. The French revolution gave a strong impetus to the growth of the republican spirit in Spain, leading directly to the revolt of 1812 in which the first distinct threat against the domination of the church was registered. While the constitution imposed upon the Bourbon king Ferdinand VII declared the Roman Catholic faith to be the religion of the state, the liberals were able to abolish the Inquisition and curtail somewhat the power of the clergy. However the forces of reaction were strong, and in 1814 Ferdinand declared the constitution null and restored the Inquisition, which continued to function until it was finally abolished in 1834. In 1820 under great pressure Ferdinand again renewed his allegiance to the 1812 constitution and again the liberal *Cortes* suppressed most of the convents and sold their properties, guaranteeing security of possession to purchasers. Having once more overthrown the constitution in 1823, the Bourbon ruler again restored the properties to the orders. The Bourbons have ever been friendly to the church and the church to the Bourbons.

Meanwhile genuine republican sentiment was growing. Men were becoming impatient at attempts to secure democracy by mere limitation of monarchical powers. They were looking forward to a genuine republic. In 1832 there appeared a book entitled *Bases of a Political Constitution*, advocating a federated form of republican government, which was in later years to exercise a powerful influence upon Spain's destiny. With reference to religion the author declared: "Each citizen may profess his religion with equal freedom but the suggestions and secret means of proselytism will be prohibited by law."¹ Many decades were to pass before this dream was to be realized. In that same year, 1832, was born Emilio Castelar, later the outstanding leader of the republican forces in Spain.

The fortunes of government shifted again and again, now more liberal, now less. The year 1834 saw the promulgation of the *Estatuto Real* which represented retrogression from the liberal achievement of 1812. In 1837 another turn of the wheel saw the 1812 constitution restored. 1845 witnessed a revision of the constitution of 1837 in the direction of that of 1834 with some modification, but in all these changes the church held its place as the religion of the state, nor was the practice of any other faith permitted.

If there had been occasional disagreements between state and church, the Concordat of 1851 concluded between Isabel II and Pope Pius IX reaffirmed in no uncertain terms the traditional relations between them. It declared that "the Catholic Apostolic Roman religion to the exclusion of every other cult continues to be the sole religion of the Spanish nation and will be conserved always in the dominion of his Catholic majesty with all the rights and prerogatives which it ought to enjoy according to the law of God and that ordained by the sacred canons." Education both private and public was to conform to church doctrines, marriage was to be performed only by the church.

The year 1856 saw the first definite break in that relationship. In the election of 1854 Spain's first really modern-spirited *Cortes* was elected. It proceeded to the formation of a new constitution which was duly promulgated in 1856. It was

1 Brandt, Joseph; *Toward the New Spain*, p. 25.

liberal in many respects, social and economic, and for the first time in the history of Spain permitted the "private exercise of religion other than Catholic."² This was in June. Reaction at once set in, however, and on September 15 the constitution of 1845, slightly liberalized, was reestablished. The Roman Catholic religion was still the religion of the state.

The republicans were naturally anti-clerical, for the church was a strong ally of the monarchy, and was in turn upheld in its privileged position by the royal party. Among the great republican leaders of the period none took a more high-minded attitude of opposition to it than Emilio Castelar, Spain's peerless orator of all time. He held that the "state does not, should not, and cannot have a religion." As for a state religion, its power, he held, lay in law, not in conscience, and this was an evil. "Is there the right today to impose religion by force?" he wrote a bishop. "Omar says yes, Christ says no." "To practice liberty in its sphere, the church ought not to be in politics, either dominating or dominated, neither the mistress of the state, nor its servant."³ The reactionary tone of the Syllabus of Pius IX issued in 1864 served to accentuate the republican opposition to the church, condemning as it did practically all the modern advances in civilization as dangerous errors, and especially such ideas as socialism and communism.

The provisional government arising out of the revolt of 1868 set itself to break the control of the church. Monasteries were ordered closed, church property was confiscated and religious orders dissolved. The church naturally resisted these orders. Sharp protests were made by the bishops and every effort was made to elect only Catholic deputies to the *Cortes Constituyentes* which was to draw up the new constitution. Three million people signed petitions asking that toleration be not granted. The strength of the church may be seen in the fact that when the constitution was promulgated Article 21 read, "The Nation is obligated to maintain the faith and the ministers of the Catholic religion." Catholicism was still the state religion of Spain.

But the declaration was not unqualified, for the article continued, "The public and private exercise of whatever other

² Brandt, Joseph: *op. cit.*, p. 54.

³ Castelar, Emilio, *Cartas*. pp. 8, 40.

faith remains guaranteed to all foreigners residing in Spain, without other restrictions than the universal rules of morality and right." So much the church might well have accepted as inevitable just as they had been obliged to yield the right of burial to Protestants in 1831, but it was further added: "If other Spaniards profess a religion other than the Catholic they shall be accorded the same treatment as provided in the foregoing paragraph." For the first time tolerance of other religions had found a place in the constitution of the nation. For the first time Protestantism was accorded the right openly to carry on its work. Bibles could now be displayed and sold. But Spain was still overwhelmingly Catholic.

The republicans were still committed to the complete separation of the church and state. The liberal premier Salmerón declared, "The Republic certainly would be unable to exist without making the independence of the church and state a definite fact, without having the state respect equally all beliefs and all religious communions."⁴ But it was not carried into effect. As late as January 2, 1874 President Castelar was still promising it, but on January 3 the Federal Republic came to an end. Following this a National Republic was formed, to endure only until December 30, 1874. On January 9, 1875, Alfonso XII, the Bourbon king, entered Spain and republicanism was dead. But some definite gains had been registered for religious tolerance. The next constitution, that of 1875, although declaring once more the Catholic faith to be that of the state, further declares in Article XI, section 2 that no one shall be molested on account of his religious opinion or in the exercise of his worship, provided the due observance of Christian morals is maintained. However it further declares, in section 3, that public ceremonies and manifestations other than that of the state religion shall not be tolerated, that is, churchly buildings, bells, inscriptions, etc. were prohibited. Church and state were still united and were to remain so for another sixty years almost, for no significant change occurred in this respect until 1931.

But though the Bourbons were generally conservative and faithful in their allegiance to the church, the radical and liberal elements were by no means completely silenced. Some min-

⁴ Brandt, *op. cit.*, p. 184.

isters have been liberal and have given the church not a few anxious moments. During the reign of Alfonso XIII the control of government shifted repeatedly from the conservatives to the liberals. On several occasions the liberals attempted "to protect the interests of the state against the church." For example in 1906 it was proposed to deprive religious orders of juridical personality, to prohibit their receiving gifts or legacies, except under definite limitations, to prohibit minors from joining orders without consent of their parents or guardians and to give liberty to dissolve orders which included foreigners. However such a storm of protest arose that the ministry was forced to resign. Again in June 1910 the premier Canalejas, although a Catholic at heart, issued permission to non-Catholic bodies to put up such signs as they thought fit on their meeting places, although according to the constitution "public ceremonies and manifestations other than those of the state religion are not permitted." In 1917 Count Romanones, then premier, raised the question of religious instruction in the state schools, since he felt that the official imposition of religious teaching in the schools contradicted the constitutional clause guaranteeing freedom of conscience. But once more a storm of protest forced the government to abandon the changes which it had introduced, and religious instruction was once more made compulsory. As late as 1923 the church was strongly opposing the freedom of dissident groups to practice their cults publicly. It was charged that the archbishop of Saragossa was assassinated in that year because of his determined opposition to constitutional reform in this direction.

The World War exercised a profound effect on Spain although she remained neutral. The post-war years saw a rapid increase of liberalism. The vast political upheavals of Russia and Germany awakened new hope in the breasts of the Spanish liberals and radicals. Extreme activity of syndicalists in Madrid, the threat of separation by Catalan and the general dissatisfaction with government, caused the declaration of a dictatorship by Primo de Rivera, with royal consent, in 1923. This, meant to be temporary, lasted six years. In 1930, on failure to secure a vote of confidence from the military and naval leaders, Rivera resigned. Alfonso named in his place General Berenguer. The republican forces were uniting. Berenguer resigned in February, 1931. The new cabinet on

February 20 ordered a call for the election of municipal and provincial officers as well as of members of the *Cortes*. This was held April 12, the central issue being that of the republic or monarchy. The result was overwhelmingly for the republic. On April 14, Zamora, president of the council, announced the republic, King Alfonso on the same day leaving for France.

It was inevitable that with the rise of the new Spanish republic the church should be disestablished. In Spain as elsewhere the rapid changes of the last few decades had created a new mind in vast numbers of people with reference to religion and to the church. Although the country was not quite so thoroughly open to the currents of the world's thought as other parts of Europe, the spirit of modernism had not failed to register itself in the Spanish consciousness. The world war, the subsequent social and economic changes, the penetration of communistic propaganda with its anti-religious bias had fostered a new set of attitudes toward the church and religion.

The leadership of the new republic has been radical in its religious ideas. Azaña, for example, the premier under whom the new constitution was formed is definitely atheistic. He has for years been a leading figure in the *Ateneo*, a radical atheistic club in Madrid. The examples of Russia and of Mexico have furnished patterns for the enemies of the church in Spain to follow.

Alfonso left Spain on April 14th. Within a few days rioting and the burning of churches and monasteries had broken out, inspired, according to Catholic sources, by the radical leaders themselves. More probably, however, this was a more or less natural result of the popular unrest and disorganization of the moment and the long restrained hatred of the church as the bulwark of the old order. All summer and autumn the *Cortes Constituyentes* struggled with the formation of the new constitution. On December 8, 1931, it was officially promulgated. The provisions with reference to religion were thoroughly unambiguous. At long last the dream of the liberals was realized—complete separation of church and state. The pertinent articles read as follows:

Article 3. "The Spanish state has no official religion."

Article 26. "All religious confessions are considered as associations subject to a special law. The state, the regions, the provinces,

and the municipalities will not maintain, favor or aid economically churches, associations, and religious institutions. A special law will provide for the total extinction, in a maximum period of two years, of the subsidy to the clergy.

"Those religious orders which in addition to the three canonical vows impose another vow of especial obedience to an authority other than the legitimate authority of the state are dissolved. Their properties shall be nationalized and allocated to beneficent and educational ends.

"Other religious orders shall be subject to a judicial law decreed by the constituent assembly in conformity with the following basis.

1. Dissolution of those orders which through their activities constitute a danger to the security of the state.

2. Inscription of those which may continue in a special registry under the ministry of justice.

3. The inability to acquire or maintain under their own names or under any other person other properties than those which are destined to their own living or the direct performance of their exclusive function.

4. The prohibition against applying themselves to industry, instruction or education.

5. Subjection to all the fiscal laws of the country.

6. The obligation to render annual account to the state of the investment of their resources for the purpose of the association in conformity with their ends.

7. The properties of the religious orders shall be nationalized."

Article 27. "Freedom of conscience as well as the right of professing and practicing freely any religion is guaranteed on Spanish soil subject to the requirements of public morality.

"Cemeteries shall be held exclusively under civil jurisdiction. Separate cemeteries may not be retained on the basis of separate religious beliefs.

"All faiths may exercise their cult in private. Public manifestations of cult are in all cases subject to the authority of the government. No one shall be constrained to declare officially his religious beliefs.

"The fact of being a religious shall not affect civil or political status except as prescribed in the rules of the present constitution for the nomination of the President of the Republic and for being President of the council of Ministers."

Article 43, without mentioning the church, strikes very

directly at one of the most important of the functions of the church. It declares that the family is under the special protection of the state (not the church). Marriage is a legal contract between equals (not a sacrament) and may be dissolved for just cause, i. e. divorce is legalized; parents have equal duties toward children born out of wedlock and those within.

Article 48 declares:

"The service of instruction is an essential attribute of the state . . . primary instruction shall be free and compulsory. Instruction shall be laical. . . . To the church it is permitted, under state control to teach its own doctrines in its own institutions."

Thus at one blow came the severance of the age old church-state relationship, the discontinuance of the support of the church, the dissolution of some orders, the closing or the severe limitation of remaining orders, the nationalization of church properties, complete freedom of conscience, the loss of the control of family relationships and finally and perhaps most seriously of all, the control of education. No wonder the Catholics were stunned. Even many republicans who were on the whole anti-clerical felt that the provisions were too drastic. Indeed Zamora, the provisional president, resigned in protest against its severity. However, later, elected president, he signed the decree. Azaña, radical premier, described by one writer as a "clear cold logician of the French school," when his government was dissolved by president Zamora, was strong enough to compel the president to recall him to form another government, and to defeat the president's attempt to render the constitutional provisions ineffective.

As is well known, a constitutional provision to become effective must be enacted into law. The Catholics, apparently including the president, hoped that it would not be made effective and for the most part their strategy has been directed to that end. Still it has been pointed out that the president could have dissolved the *Cortes* and called for new elections but did not do so.

The Catholic protest was vigorous. There were those among the bishops who counselled resistance as in Mexico. Indeed one bishop was exiled because of his violent opposition, but wiser counsels prevailed. The Papal Nuncio, Federico

Tadeschini, a clever diplomat, was able to forestall direct action which he feared would only result in disaster, and has sought by the creation of public opinion to defeat the radical purposes of the anti-clericals.

A vigorous letter of protest by the bishops was issued December 20. To note only a few of their complaints, they wrote:

"Under the new Constitution for everyone except the church there is right and liberty in everything.

"Every religion may be freely professed and practiced except the Catholic . . . it is restricted in its every act.

"Every sort of subversive association may meet freely but the greatest precautions are taken against the religious orders which devote themselves to the rigorous perfection of their own members, to social work, education, religion, and service.

"Freedom is extended to absurd and antisocial systems to think and express themselves but the church may teach its own doctrines only in its own establishments and subject to government inspections.

"There is freedom of public assembly for every purpose but for religious processions. There is liberty to choose any profession but no freedom to choose the religious life of the cloister.

"There is freedom to teach and advocate every system of ideas however erroneous, but religion may not be taught in state schools and the religious orders are denied the right to teach.

"The state may subsidize any association except the church and her institutions.

"The right of private property is recognized but the right of the church to hold or administer property is restricted.

"The constitution seems to guarantee equal rights to all. The restrictions placed on worship and the church stand out as a deliberate and unjust discrimination."

They close with an appeal to the Catholics of Spain to remain within the law but to be faithful in the performance of every religious duty, to cultivate their spiritual life and to proceed bravely in the defense of their faith which present realities make unavoidable.⁵

The pope in response to a letter of appeal from the Spanish bishops wrote a Spanish Encyclical, which under all the circumstances seems rather mild. In it he apparently took little

5 *Razón y Fé*, Vol. 98, pp. 246-247.

account of the charge made by many that the new constitution was in direct violation of the Concordat of 1851 quoted above. It reads in part as follows:

"In the face of a law so injurious to ecclesiastical rights and liberties, rights that we must defend and preserve integral, we believe that it is precisely the duty of our Apostolic Ministry to reprove and condemn it. Therefore, we solemnly protest with all our strength against the law itself, declaring that it cannot be invoked against the inalienable rights of the church. And we wish here to reaffirm our lively confidence that our beloved children of Spain, understanding the injustice and harm of these provisions will bring to bear all legitimate means which, in view of the nature of the law and of its interpretations, rest in their power to induce these same legislators to reform these dispositions which are so contrary to the rights of every citizen and so hostile to the church, substituting other laws reconcilable with Catholic conscience."⁶

There is evidence that many Catholics were not at first so deeply concerned at the anti-clerical provisions, because they believed that the provisions would not be put into effect. But if they did entertain any such hope they were destined to be disappointed, for almost immediately a decree was issued ordering the dissolution of the Jesuit order, and within a year and a half the *Cortes* had passed legislation expropriating church property to the value of over \$500,000,000, and had provided for sweeping changes in the whole educational system to become effective by the end of 1933. According to this some eighty thousand monks and nuns were to be obliged to give up their work of teaching and the state would aid them only on renunciation of their vows. A Protestant was made director of primary education.

The practical difficulty in the way of thoroughgoing laicization of instruction is the fact that there is not a sufficient number of state schools to take care of the school population nor are there lay teachers enough to man the schools. There is enough possibility of difference of opinion with reference to certain clauses in the law relating to education for the government, lacking resources to provide for the education of its children, to permit Catholic schools to continue under close supervision. The main provisions of the law of religious faiths read as follows:

Article 2. "According to the Constitution, the freedom of con-

⁶ *Ibid.*, Vol. 102, p. 298.

science, the practice and the abstention from religious activities are guaranteed in Spain."

Article 3. "The state has no official religion. All faiths may exercise freely their cult within their temples. To do so outside, special government authorization is required in every case. Religious meetings and manifestations shall not have a political character regardless of where they may be held."

Article 7. "Religious confessions shall have liberty to name their ministers, administrators and those in charge of ecclesiastical functions, and those so named shall be Spaniards. Nevertheless the state reserves the right not to recognize persons who may be considered dangerous to the order or security of the state."

Article 11. "Temples of all sorts, episcopal palaces, rectories, monasteries, and all other properties destined to the Catholic cult or her ministers shall be national or public property. The same applies to furniture, ornaments, jewels, etc."

Article 12. "The things and rights referred to above shall continue to be used for the same ends of Catholic worship, for which purpose they shall continue in the power of the church for their keeping, administration and use. The church shall not dispose of them and shall limit them in their use to the ends to which they are designed. However, the state, for motives justified by public necessity and by means of a special law, may dispose of these properties for other ends than those indicated above."

Article 20. "The churches may found and direct institutions designed for the teaching of their respective doctrines and for the preparation of their ministers. Inspection of the state shall guarantee that within such institutions doctrines dangerous to the security of the state shall not be taught."

Article 23. "Religious orders and congregations admitted in Spain according to article 26 of the constitution may not engage in any political activity under pain of suspension. They must be properly inscribed in the public register. They may not own properties or resources not necessary for their living or the fulfillment of their special function. They may not engage in industry, commerce, or farming either directly or indirectly and are given one year from the date of publication of this law to withdraw from such activities if they are now so engaged."

The irritation of the Catholics, great enough because of the severe restrictions upon their faith, was immensely increased by the passage of the so-called Defense Act which practically suspended constitutional guarantees. Among other provisions it declared it to be an aggression against the republic.

⁷ "Ley de Confesiones y Congregaciones Religiosas." *Razón y Fé*, Vol. 102, pp. 401-407.

1. To incite against or resist or dissolve any law or order of legislative authority.
2. To diffuse news which might injure credit or disturb the peace.
3. To commit any act of violence for motives that are religious, political or social or to incite others to commit such acts.
4. To do or express anything that might encourage disrespect for institutions or organisms of the state.

Passed first during the exciting days of October when the constitution was being debated, and giving near-dictatorial powers to the government, it was re-enacted the very same day the constitution was promulgated. This the Catholics claimed was in violation of the spirit of the republic which had won an overwhelming victory largely on the basis that it would bring to an end an infamous dictatorship. The people had simply exchanged one dictatorship for another.

Probably it was a great tactical blunder on the part of the government. They had been elected not to destroy the church, but to free Spain from a complete dictatorship. They had won by the vote of many Catholics who had not dreamed that they would go so far in crippling the church. Spain was not yet strongly anti-Catholic, even if its vote had been anti-clerical. The Catholics began vigorously to organize opposition. Within a brief period, early in 1932, they had organized the *Acción Católica* for the defense of the church and also an *Acción Popular* with the purpose of upholding its interests in the political situation. Early in 1933 the editor of *El Debate* formed a *Confederación de Derechos Autonomos* to work for the repeal of the anti-clerical provisions of the law, and other radical measures such as favorable concessions to labor. He would proceed by constitutional means to secure these ends. He accepts the republic and urges Catholics and conservatives to do so. Even the pope, according to the *Osservatore Romano*, seems to be willing to accept it if the government will abandon its anti-clerical attitudes and permit the church "to live in the Spanish republic with dignity, respected in its rights and the exercise of its divine missions."⁸

The first popular vote which would test the government's strength was taken in Catalonia in 1932. It resulted in a loss of some 140,000 votes in comparison with the 1931 vote. The

⁸ *Current History*, February, 1934, p. 616.

opposition party which had protested the government's seizure of church properties and other anti-clerical activities received 147,000 votes over against 86,000 in 1931. Evidently the swing of public opinion was toward the "right."

By December, 1933, when a new election to the *Cortes* took place, the first national vote since the promulgation of the constitution, the trend toward the right was even more evident. The new *Cortes* is decidedly conservative. In the constitutional *Cortes* there were 114 Socialists, now there are 58. The Radical Socialists, with 55 in the former, have not a single representative in the present *Cortes*. Among the groups, Right, Center, and Left, the 473 deputies are divided as follows: the Right 207, including the Agrarians 88, Popular Action 62, and the Monarchists 43; the Center 170, including 105 radicals, 25 Catalan League, 18 Conservatives and several representatives of lesser groups; the Left 94, including 56 Socialists, 19 Catalan Left, and one Communist, the rest representing various small parties. Obviously neither the Right nor the Left could control affairs without the support of the center.

The Lerroux government, representing chiefly the Center and Right parties, set for itself a moderate program which so far as religion is concerned was designed to ease the blow to the church in some respects, without, however, restoring it to its former status by any means. Recognizing the difficult situation in which the rural clergy were left by the withdrawal of state support they favored the continuance of state aid to them in the form of pensions.⁹ Further recognizing the inability of the state at once to take over all primary and secondary instruction, they agreed not to close any more of the schools conducted by the religious orders until the state could supply a sufficient number of teachers.

What will the final result be? It is always risky to prophesy. Before this article appears the whole situation with reference to the church may have changed. If the writer were to hazard a prophecy it would be that the republic will stand, separation of church and state will be maintained, but the severity of the strictures on the orders is likely to be relaxed, and some sort of compromise in the field of education will make it possible for

⁹ In April 7,500 clergymen were put back on the state payroll for life. A pension fund of 10,000,000 pesetas will be required annually to meet this.

the church to continue some form of educational work. The inability of the government to meet the demands for schools and teachers will probably require this.

It does not seem likely that the major gains for tolerance and freedom of worship will be lost—even in Spain—in this the fourth decade of the enlightened twentieth century.

WAS FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE A BROAD-CHURCHMAN?

CHARLES RICHARD SANDERS

Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia

Although Frederick Denison Maurice, from about 1853 until his death in 1872, was frequently spoken of as a member of the Broad-Church school in the Church of England, and was considered by some of his contemporaries both the founder of that school and the greatest of the Broad-Churchmen, and although he is today usually referred to as a leader of the Broad-Church movement, his relation to it was not simple. He himself steadfastly refused to accept the label of "Broad-Churchman" for himself and to admit the need for a Broad-Church party. What the school stood for is as elusive of definition, furthermore, as his own thought was complex. Yet the question, in spite of its difficulty, is well worth going into, since its exploration serves to illustrate not only the difference between conservatism and liberalism, but also the differences between some of the forms of liberalism within itself. A satisfactory answer to the question would also do much to make clear the meaning and the nature of the Broad-Church movement.

The popular use of the term *Broad-Church* as applied to a type of liberalism within the Church of England arose near the middle of the nineteenth century. Benjamin Jowett, according to the *New English Dictionary*, said that the term was first proposed, in his hearing, by Arthur Hugh Clough, and that it became colloquially familiar in Oxford circles a few years before 1850.¹ Some significance should also be attached to an article by A. P. Stanley, published in the *Edinburgh Review* for July, 1850, which asserted that the English church was, "by the very conditions of its being, not High or Low, but Broad."² But the general use of the term probably should be

¹ Ed. J. A. H. Murray (Oxford and New York, 1888), I, 1117.

² "Report of the Judgment in the Case of Gorham versus the Bishop of Exeter," *Edin. Rev.*, XCII (1850), 266.

dated from October, 1853, when an unsigned article by W. J. Conybeare entitled "Church Parties" appeared in the same periodical. This article, which compared in some detail what its author considered the characteristic tendencies of Broad-Churchism with those of the other parties in the Anglican church, said that this party had been called "Moderate, Catholic, or Broad-Church, by its friends; Latitudinarian or Indifferent by its enemies."³ Sir Leslie Stephen in his sketch of Maurice in the *Dictionary of National Biography* (1894) gave Conybeare credit for originating the name.⁴

Maurice himself undoubtedly believed that Conybeare invented the term. In 1856, three years after the appearance of Conybeare's article, he said, in referring to its author, that he "ventured upon the perilous experiment of coining a new nickname which was eagerly welcomed by hundreds;" but that "the conceptions which have been formed of his meaning by those who have adopted his phrase have certainly been anything but clear and definite."⁵ In a letter to the Rev. Isaac Taylor, dated April 10, 1860, he said "I do not know well what the Broad-Church is. I always took it to be a fiction of Conybeare's."⁶

What the Broad-Church movement was cannot be set down without difficulty. It was, to be sure, a type of religious liberalism within the Anglican church; but the main difficulty lies in distinguishing between it and other types of liberalism with which it can by no means be identified. The Broad-Churchmen, furthermore, did not form a compact and homogeneous party or school, but differed among themselves as much, frequently, as they differed from others not belonging to their group. As Liberals, they would naturally disagree on many important points. That there were, however, certain tendencies of thoughts which were common to them all was recognized by their contemporaries and has been regarded as a certainty

³ *Edin. Rev.*, XCVIII (1853), 330 ff.

⁴ (London, 1894), XXXVII, 104.

⁵ "Essay on Archdeacon Hare's Position in the Church, with Reference to the Parties That Divide It," J. C. Hare's *The Victory of Faith*, ed. E. H. Plumptre (3rd ed.; London, 1874), p. [xvii].

⁶ *The Life of Frederick Denison Maurice, Chiefly Told in His Own Letters*, ed. by his son Frederick Maurice (3rd ed.; London, 1884) [hereafter referred to as the *Life*], II, 358-9. H. R. Haweis related the following anecdote about Maurice. "I one day inadvertently let drop the word 'Broad Church.' 'Broad Church! I am sure I don't know what you mean; if you mean the so-called liberal theologians, they seem to me extremely narrow.' 'Broad Church,' he used to say, 'is a fiction of Conybeare's. I never had, and never will have, anything to do with it.' " "Frederick Denison Maurice," *Contemporary Review*, LXV (1894), 877.

ever since the movement gained momentum in the middle of the century. These tendencies may be indicated by a survey of the successive attempts to define the movement which have been made since 1853.

Conybeare, in his article on "Church Parties" (1853), said that Broad-Churchmen were characterized by their desire for comprehension, by their adopting Charity and Toleration as their watchwords, by their belief that the balancing and compromising character of the Church of England was among her greatest claims to admiration, by their belief that the principle of toleration should be pushed still farther, that the superficial difficulties between Christians were as nothing in comparison with their essential agreement, and that "the portals of the church should be flung as widely open as the gates of Heaven." They were of the opinion, according to Conybeare, that the essential doctrines of the church had been held by Christians in every age, both Protestants and Catholics. They objected to the ascription, by either Puritan or Papist, of magic virtue to outward acts. They embraced the positive and rejected the negative in other beliefs. They gave a special prominence to the idea of the "Visible Church." They deserved chief credit for "the great advance recently made in the secular instruction of the poor." But they had "so little organization or mutual concert of any kind" that they could scarcely be called a party at all.⁷

Sir Leslie Stephen, in an article entitled "The Broad Church," published in 1870, said that Broad-Churchmen, although they should be condemned for compromising love of truth with reverence for tradition, should be praised for meeting arguments fairly, and admitting in theory the importance of "searching, fair and unfettered inquiry." He implied, however, that they did not always put their theory into practice.⁸

E. H. Plumptre, writing in 1874, set forth three characteristics of Broad-Churchmen: first, a refusal to run in party grooves or to be bound by party shibboleths; second, a disclaiming of the party character; third, an attitude which never shrank from taking up an unpopular cause when truth and justice required it.⁹

⁷ *Op. cit.*, pp. 330-42.

⁸ *Fraser's Mag.*, LXXXI (March, 1870), 316.

⁹ Preface to J. C. Hare's *The Victory of Faith* (3rd ed.; London, 1874) p. xv.

"R. E. B.," in an article entitled "The Broad Church Movement" (1878), said that the movement was a tendency rather than a party and that it lacked any bond of "dogmatic agreement." It could hardly be said to have, he asserted, either a literature or leaders or objects in the same sense as had the other two great parties which divided the church. He quoted McLeod Campbell's statement that they were a party "*rather as asking freedom to think than as having formed thoughts.*" It was the party of inquiry, while the others were parties of authority. A Broad-Churchman was one who, whatever his views on this and that department of theological belief might be, had not accepted them second-hand or on the authority of a church or a party or a teacher, but had, so far as in him lay, "hammered them out painfully by the sweat of his brow," and had, so far as the faculty and the opportunity were given to him, "patiently proved all things before accepting them into his mental armoury." The Broad-Churchman believed that revelation was given, not once and for all, but gradually during different ages, that neither the sixteenth nor the nineteenth century had a monopoly on truth. His great danger was that of giving "too exclusive attention to the intellectual side of religion." The outstanding Broad-Churchmen, listed in chronological order, were: Bishop Butler, Archbishop Whately, Dr. Thomas Arnold, F. D. Maurice, and Charles Kingsley.¹⁰

Connop Thirlwall, in his *Remains, Literary and Theological* (1878), said that "the proper antithesis to Broad is not High or Low, but Narrow." He gave a brief definition of the Broad-Church characteristic.

"I understand it as signifying a certain stamp of individual character, which I would describe as a disposition to recognize and appreciate that which is true and good under all varieties of forms, and in persons separated from one another by the most conflicting opinions."

He named Jeremy Taylor and Archdeacon J. C. Hare as typical Broad-Churchmen.¹¹

Principal John Tulloch, in *Movements of Religious Thought in Britain During the Nineteenth Century* (1885), asserted that the great work of the Broad-Churchmen, like that of the Cambridge Platonists, was apologetic, not dogmatic. They advanced theological inquiry by their rational spirit and

¹⁰ *Fraser's Mag.*, XCVII (March, 1878), 353-64.

¹¹ Ed. J. J. S. Perowne (London, 1878), III, 481.

by their "fearless assertion of the rights of Theology in the face of Modern Science." With "low-breathed Scepticism" facing them on the one hand and "mere formal theology" facing them on the other, they were "witnesses for a Christianity that had nothing to fear from the progress of Knowledge." They presented "man's essential Divinity in Christ, as lying at the basis of all true thought." Broad-Churchism was "essentially a reconstruction movement of Christian ideas which were losing their hold on contemporary minds."¹²

The *New English Dictionary* (1888) defined *Broad Church* as "A designation popularly applied to the members of the Church of England who take its formularies and doctrines in a broad or liberal sense, and hold that the church should be comprehensive and tolerant, so as to admit more or less variety of opinion in matters of dogma and ritual."¹³

V. F. Storr, in *The Development of English Theology in the Nineteenth Century, 1800-1860* (1913), contrasted the Broad-Church and Oxford movements by saying that the former "sought to justify religion by an appeal to the spiritual instincts of humanity, and gave to reason a larger meaning than Newman gave it."¹⁴

These definitions, although they do not include all of those which have shed light on the subject, represent fairly accurately the conceptions of the movement which have been presented. They agree, for the most part, in considering Broad-Churchism a form of religious liberalism which worked towards toleration. But when they are compared with each other they show that a confusion has existed, due to the inclination of some to define it so as to include the whole liberal movement in religious thought and of others to limit it to include only those who, like Maurice, were liberals only in a special sense. The distinction between the two conceptions of liberalism is highly essential to a clear understanding both of what the Broad-Church movement was, and of what kind of liberalism is to be associated with Maurice. What was the difference, we may ask, between the Broad-Church, as it was generally thought of, and Maurice's

¹² (New York, 1893), p. 278.

¹³ Vol. I, p. 1117. For later developments in the Broad-Church movement, see H. R. Haweis, "The Broad Church," *Contemporary Review*, LVII (1890), 900-910. The treatment here, however, is not very penetrating.

¹⁴ (London, New York, etc., 1913), p. 284.

conception of the Universal Church? Maurice's own comments on the Broad-Church help to answer the question.

Maurice was very positive in denying that he should be called a "Broad-Churchman." His son said that the title was given to his father by those who, finding it "not very easy to get him and all about him conveniently in a nutshell, . . . solved the difficulty by dubbing him a Broad-Churchman, not that they had the faintest notion what they meant by the phrase" except that it was in common use.¹⁵ Maurice himself stated emphatically that his own "disease" was one which he neither caught "by contact with any of the Broad-Church school" nor communicated to them.¹⁶

He persistently maintained this position, because, in the first place, he feared either that Broad-Churchmen were already a party or that they showed a strong tendency to become one. He had always felt that to maintain the position of a true Churchman he must be hostile to all parties.¹⁷ "I cannot enter a party," he said, "for the sake of compassing an end which involves the destruction of party."¹⁸ It made no difference to him if "Comprehension" was the slogan of the new party.

"We separate from our fellows, on the plea that they are not sufficiently comprehensive; we strive to break down fences which other people have raised, even while we are making a thicker and more thorny one ourselves."¹⁹

A Broad-Church party, "such as has been dreamed of," was to him both unnecessary and impossible.²⁰ The thing which he most feared was that a set of men might select from his teaching a number of tenets which they would exalt as infallible shibboleths, and thus make a new test for determining who were the "elect."²¹ He would not belong to a party, even if "No Party" were inscribed on its banner.²²

¹⁵ *Life*, II, 527.

¹⁶ "The Thirty-nine Articles and the Broad-Church," *Spectator*, XLIII (1870), 435. Cf. also Sir Edward Strachey, "Recollections of F. D. Maurice," *Cornhill Mag.*, LXXV (Apr., 1897), 541 n. Contrast Thirlwall's attitude: "... I cannot bring myself to treat 'Broad Church' as a term of reproach" (*op. cit.*, p. 481).

¹⁷ *Life*, I, 181-2.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, II, 7.

¹⁹ *Theological Essays* (3rd ed.; London and New York, 1871), p. 6.

²⁰ "Essay on Hare's Position," J. C. Hare's *Victory of Faith*, p. xix.

²¹ *Life*, II, 607-8. His son wrote: "Beyond all other things he dreaded becoming the head of a party of Christian Socialists. His great wish was to Christianize Socialism, not to Christian-Socialize the universe." (*Ibid.*, p. 41).

²² *Ibid.*, I, 239.

A second reason for his refusal to join those who professed themselves Broad-Churchmen is that he took them to be the sort of liberals who cared little or nothing for the time-honored beliefs and practices of the Church of England, or for the study of theology. He supposed that the Broad-Church was a representation, under different modifications, of that creed "contained in Whately's books," or of that which had arisen at Oxford "out of reaction against Tractarianism."²³ He could go along with them, he said, so far as they protested "against any cowardice and deceit in handling the Word of God, against any misrepresentations of sceptics, against any traditional hardness or formality."²⁴ Their tendency to deify man's intellect, however, instead of using the reason to perceive and acknowledge a living God, he found highly objectionable.²⁵ He could not agree with them that the Anglican liturgy was "an old praying machine," which in the course of centuries got out of order like other machines, and which had to be altered "according to the improved mechanical notions" of the nineteenth century.²⁶ These liberals were to him "emphatically anti-theological, . . . ready to tolerate all opinions in theology, only because people could know nothing about it, and because other studies were much better pursued without reference to it."²⁷ "But," he exclaimed, "their breadth seems to me narrowness. They include all kinds of opinions. But what message have they for the people who do not live upon opinions or care for opinions?"²⁸

Maurice could not, furthermore, join those Broad-Churchmen who discredited the Thirty-Nine Articles. The Articles, he said, "do exhibit, to anyone who reads them either as a historical document or as a guide for the present, a union of Catholicism with Protestantism." He found in them "no hint of compromise," but a strong "spirit of assertion, . . . the assumption that without individuality and nationality there can be no unity, no universality," but merely something like Roman Catholicism. The Articles protested, moreover, against excessive Protestantism, thriving only at the expense of unity.

23 *Ibid.*, II, 358-9.

24 *Ibid.*

25 *Ibid.*

26 *Ibid.*

27 *Ibid.*, I, 183-4.

28 *Ibid.*

Maurice asserted that although his own century had developed a need for a more comprehensive humanity and a more spiritual theology than had existed in the sixteenth, "the groundwork of this theology and this humanity" had been laid bare in the Thirty-Nine Articles, to which, he said, his age must recur if it was to escape destruction from sectarianism. The Broad-Church, he objected, sought to glorify its own age at the expense of all others.

"All I can hear from it is a cry to leave the sixteenth century and believe in the nineteenth. So long as I believe in God, I do not mean to believe in any century; though I may earnestly believe that He has assigned a work to every century which no other can perform, and which it can only perform when it looks before and behind and ceases to glorify itself."²⁹

Much of the confusion which has appeared in discussions of the Broad-Church ever since a controversy over the subject was precipitated by the publication of *Essays and Reviews* in 1860 has resulted from lumping together all the liberals in the Anglican Church under the label "Broad-Churchmen," and from a failure to distinguish between the two major groups of these liberals. The one group, which included Copleston, Whately, Hampden, Dr. Arnold, Blanco White, Baden Powell, and Jowett, was closely associated with Oxford.³⁰ The other group, the Coleridgians, which included Coleridge himself, Julius Charles Hare, John Sterling, F. D. Maurice, Charles Kingsley, and, in many respects, Carlyle, Tennyson, and Browning, tended to associate itself with Cambridge. Although both schools advocated freedom of inquiry and assertion, the Oxford school was predominantly Aristotelian and displayed a faith in formal logic, while the Cambridge school was predominantly Platonic and Kantian, and tended to be hostile to mere logic, at the same time that it was favorably disposed towards the use of the intuition, or the "reason" of Coleridge and Kant, as a means to the perception of truth. Both groups welcomed the progress of science and of textual criticism of the Bible, but the Oxford school tended to exalt the intellect above all else, while the Cambridge group insisted that the intellect could not of itself create truth, which God must reveal, and that the only sure

²⁹ The whole paragraph is abstracted from "The Thirty-nine Articles and the Broad-Church," *Spectator*, XLIII (1870), 434-5.

³⁰ An excellent study of this group has been made by the Rev. W. Tuckwell in *Pre-Tractarian Oxford: A Reminiscence of the Oriel "Noetics"* (London, 1909).

evidence of truth was in the testimony of the whole man, not merely in that of the understanding. The first group, in its love for progress and change, became hostile to tradition and church authority; the second loved progress, but sought to reconcile love of change with reverence for the past and its institutions. Although both venerated history, the former read history in the light of the present, the latter, in the light of what they took to be "eternal principles." The first group was of necessity entirely out of sympathy with the Oxford movement, which was in part a protest against their tendencies of thought; the second, although unable to agree with the Tractarians on many vital points, had much in common with them. It is not strange that Maurice felt that he could not be properly classed with the whole mass of liberals composing both groups.

To understand Maurice's position, we must bear in mind that his Church Universal was conceived as resting upon eternal, immutable truth. Each man, he taught, must seek out this truth for himself, by the power of his God-given reason. No man could receive it second-hand from a party or from any other intermediary. He could not create it with his understanding, or intellect, as many liberals would like to do. Since truth was eternal, it did not grow with time. The *revelation* of it, however, did progress from age to age. One age, of course, might get a clearer and broader glimpse of the truth than another. An age progressed only by building upon the foundations of the past, not by rejecting the large mass of truth discovered in the past for the small fraction of it discovered in the present. Not the time when truth was revealed, but the purity and wholeness of it whenever found was what mattered. If the Church of England, with its formularies and ritual, had proved itself a repository for a great portion of essential truth, then men should not reject this truth or any other, no matter when it had been formulated, merely because their own age might interpret it differently. Neither were they to stop seeking for truth, for truth was inexhaustible and became real to any man only when it became a part of him. But only truth would serve: compromise for the sake of comprehension, freedom of thought divorced from standards of truth, a passion for what is new which ignored the worth of what is old,—none of these, even if the Broad-Church rested upon them, could serve as the basis of a universal spiritual brotherhood. Maurice believed that conservatism and liberalism were the same thing to those who

aimed only at truth. Like his teacher, Coleridge,³¹ he combined a consuming desire for unity with a willingness to defend freedom of inquiry and assertion; a veneration for the truth that was old with a sincere respect for the truth that was new or still undiscovered; a conception of a God of power and love with a conception of a God of truth; and an insistence on man's rights as an individual with a like insistence on man's duties as a social being. Only in this sense was he a Broad-Churchman. If Maurice is to be called a Broad-Churchman (and it is probable that he will always be referred to as one in spite of his own objections), it follows that there cannot be a real Broad-Church party, although there may be individual Broad-Churchmen and even a Broad-Church movement.

³¹ I have made a detailed study of Maurice's indebtedness to Coleridge in "The Relation of Frederick Denison Maurice to Coleridge," Dissertation for the Ph. D. The University of Chicago, 1934.

BOOK REVIEWS

OXFORD APOSTLES, A CHARACTER STUDY OF THE OXFORD MOVEMENT

By GEOFFREY FABER. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934. 450 pages. \$4.00.

Geoffrey Faber has every qualification needed to write an unusual book about the group of unusual men who began the Oxford Movement. His grandfather, the Rev. Francis Atkinson Faber, was Fellow of Magdalen in 1834, a "moderate and sensible man," who saw from the first the far reaching implications of the "Movement," and was a friend of Newman, who acknowledged the strange spell he exercised without surrendering his mind to it. Frederick Faber was Geoffrey Faber's grand-uncle. With such family connections the author has inherited memories, associations and papers to give his study a background and rooting which, as far as the reviewer knows, no recent writer in this field possesses. He also knows his Oxford.

The family papers which include letters Francis Faber "received from Newman over a long stretch of years before and after 1845" do not seem to have been used directly so much as we might wish but the study of them led to this book. The author confesses how their "smell of the old English clerical and professional tradition," a musty smell, led him to expect to find the study of the origins of the Oxford Movement a dusty business. He found it instead "absolutely interesting." So is his book. The sources he uses, outside himself, are now familiar to every student of Newman, his times and his associates. All the familiar things turn up from John Henry's first dinner in Hall to Father Dominic drying his clothes before the fire at Littlemore and Newman on his knees before him.

Between is the whole strange, stormy, trivial and epochal Pilgrim's Progress of a group of men who made a little stage the scene of a great drama. They are all there: Pusey with his hair shirt and Hurrell Froude with his brilliant febrile mind, Keble with his first languishing beauty and his later abnormal physique; dons and fellows and heads; church politics and convocations like a holy mob; tracts and bishops; dull sermons which made history and other sermons which made literature; the dissolution of an old order, the beginning of a new order, and men and institutions caught in the strain finding their way out according to their genius and their destiny.

Faber's book is distinctive for four things besides his own unusual background and fine style. First, for his vivid reconstruction of the Oxford of the 20's, 30's, and 40's. Strange how that has escaped most

writers. Oxford was not then a suburb of the Morris-Cowley motor works and a tourist center with the "High" full of char-a-bancs and motorcycles, but "a sweet city with dreaming spires" which you entered directly through cornfields and unenclosed meadows to pass under the shadow of Magdalen Tower, on "Blenheim" coach with the guard playing "The Maid of Llangollen" and "Black Will," the driver holding the reins over high-bred horses—a world in itself.

Second: for an acute psychological analysis of the "Apostles" after the latest technique with a strong dash of Freud. The chapter on "Virginity and Friendship" is pretty strong writing and has had already a considerable repercussion in the English press. Faber's analysis of Newman is, to this reviewer's mind, by far the most adequate examination to which he has been subjected and really reaches the roots of the complex of strength and weakness which has long made Newman the biographer's challenge and despair.

Third: Enough plain speaking about the "Apostles" and their ways to make what is written soundly critical as well as sympathetically appreciative. Newman especially is hard to write about with a detached touch and a fair mind. Faber has managed it. He knows when poetry is bad as well as when English prose is given timeless distinction and he keeps his balance.

Fourth: A delightful content of gossip. The Muse of History has always, when left to herself, loved to sit on the back-stairs and get the current small-talk and comment on that engaging region of any human household. She will grace, if you insist, the State apartments and use the grand stair-case, but she knows that her real business is carried on up and down the "escalier derobé." Faber manages all this with humor and discretion but the vivid color of his book and the assuring human element in it are thus secured. The reviewer, who has no flair for proof reading himself, finds a certain satisfaction and little ground for criticism in the two pages of Corrigenda. They simply show how many typographical errors a book may have and still be an exceedingly good book. This is the best which has been done in its field.

Gaius Glenn Atkins.

Auburn Theological Seminary

JOHN R. MOTT, WORLD CITIZEN

By BASIL MATHEWS. New York: Harper and Brothers. 469 pages, \$3.00.

It is fitting that a review of this book should appear in *Church History*, for the subject of it has made some very distinct contributions to church history. Not himself an ecclesiastic but always a layman, occupied for the great part of his life in the direction of non-church organizations—the Y. M. C. A. and the World Christian Student Federation, he is nevertheless a great churchman and when the history

of the church in this age is finally written it is likely that his name will bulk large, perhaps more largely than any other of his generation.

Mott was first interested in students here and around the world, and his earlier years were devoted to student work in America and abroad. But the great passion of his life was missions. It led him to become one of the founders of the Student Volunteer Movement. It early sent him on a mission to the students of the world resulting in the organization of the World Christian Student Federation, designed to bind the youth of various nations together in Christian purpose. In this he touched and influenced a host of young people, from among whom many of the present leaders of the Christian world were recruited.

His world wide interest and acquaintance made him the logical chairman of the Edinburgh Conference—the first great world missionary conference. Since that time no other person has presided over so many important gatherings related to the expanding work of Christianity at home or abroad. It made him the most commanding figure in the missionary world, a position which he has held for over twenty years.

It was in the numerous continuation conferences following Edinburgh and the other world or regional conferences that Mott's major contribution to the organization of the expanding church has been registered. To him in no small measure goes the credit for the formation of those Christian Councils which in the great mission fields have come into being and are now recognized as the leaders of the Christian forces in each field. Probably no greater stimulus to church union has been given than that furnished by these councils, for while their influence has been chiefly local, the fact of the close cooperation of the field forces has reacted powerfully on the home churches. Having demonstrated the possibility of working together abroad, churches are increasingly unable to justify continued separate existence at home. Out of the China Council grew the United Church of China.

Dr. Mott early conceived a deep interest in the Eastern churches, especially in Russia and the near East. His frequent contacts with eastern leaders and his genuine and sympathetic interest in them and their problems made him probably the best loved and most trusted western figure to the Orthodox church. The growing rapprochement between the Protestant groups of the West and these eastern churches owes much to him.

No religious leader in the modern world has traveled more widely than Mott. His record passes 1,700,000 miles over the forty years, or more than an average of 40,000 miles every year. The book is surely a graphic continuation of the Acts of the Apostles.

One of his greatest services to the cause of church history has been the sending of a church history deputation, including Doctors Case and Schermerhorn, to visit the various fields and stimulate interest in the study of church history as well as in the collection and preservation of important materials on the basis of which the history of the developing younger churches may be adequately written.

Basil Matthews has in this stimulating book not only written a first rate biography—one of the best I have read—but has also made a distinct contribution to the field of church history.

Charles S. Braden.

Northwestern University,
Evanston, Ill.

CHRISTIAN MISSIONS AND A NEW WORLD CULTURE

By ARCHIBALD G. BAKER. Chicago: Willet Clark and Company, 1934.
322 pages. \$2.00.

There has long been a need for a book like this. Christian missions have been written about from many points of view. Of promotional books there is no end; of history there have been a few good ones; sharply critical books and books of apology have not been infrequent. Only a few have been really addressed to a fundamental inquiry as to the whole nature of missionary process. In this latter class none has so skillfully or so adequately analyzed the problem as has Professor Baker. His approach is essentially that of a sociologist. The missionary enterprise is simply one phase of a world-wide sociological process and as such obeys the ordinary sociological and psychological laws which rule in this area. A missionary is not merely a convinced individual Christian who goes to preach to individuals of another race, but he is one of a multitude of aspects of a given culture which is impinging in multitudinous ways upon another total culture. The result is that missions will be quite as much influenced by other cultural contacts as by those of missionary skill and devotion.

In the beginning of his book, Professor Baker discusses religions as phases of culture. In the second part, he discusses the processes of culture transfusion. Here he analyzes that transfusion in great detail, making use of the "stimulus-response circuit" idea, discussing the methods of influencing behavior as well as methods of discrimination. Part three deals with remaking personality, society and culture, involving a study of the very structure of culture and personality, the phenomena of disintegration, of reintegration through new groups and reintegration about some center of reference, and finally Jesus Christ as a center of reference. The fourth part is a statement of a philosophy of missions to which this approach logically leads.

Of what value is a book of this sort likely to be? In the first place it has the merit of seeing the problem of missions in its true perspective, as but a part of a much vaster whole. Any one who sees this relationship and who believes in the necessity of missions can never again fail to seek the Christianization of our whole culture. In the second place it gives a brief but intelligent criticism of the underlying aims and methods of foreign missions. Nothing is clearer to the careful observer of modern missions than that there is something radically wrong with missions "as is." The Layman's Missions Inquiry report, *Re-Thinking Missions*, goes far in that direction but it is not so far

reaching or so thorough-going as Professor Baker's book. Third, it furnishes the basis of a new optimism—not at all of the Pollyanna type—that, carried forward in the light of the understanding of the process as here analyzed, there is great reason to believe that the major ends of the missionary cause may be achieved. Finally, there is evident even in the presence of a most thorough-going, radical critique of missions a powerful set of motivating forces which may in the end prove as powerful or more powerful than those of the older orthodoxy.

It strikes the reviewer that a most interesting study might be made of church history from the standpoint of Professor Baker's analysis. The attempted application of his central thesis might prove exceedingly stimulating in some of the periods of church history which are ordinarily considered the most barren.

Charles S. Braden.

Northwestern University,
Evanston, Ill.

WILLIAM PENN

By C. E. VULLIAMY. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934. xii, 303 pages. \$3.00.

To Americans, William Penn is significant for his association with that majestic if somewhat tarnished monument to his name, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. His present biographer demonstrates, in this temperate and cautious study, that this is Penn's chief claim to fame. The son of a successful middle-class "trimmer" in Restoration England, Penn apparently defied all the traditions of his class to join the Friends where his rank and his fiery pamphleteering won him a certain prominence. Lacking the religious genius of Fox, the patient saintliness of Pennington, the lucid learning of Barclay, Penn would hardly have deserved memorability but for his connection with the Quaker colonizing ventures and the projects for a "Holy Experiment".

In connection with the Pennsylvania grant, the author's suggestions as to the motives of the court certainly deserve comment. Penn had been quite active in support of Algernon Sidney's campaigns for the Exclusion Parliaments, but Charles' friendship for the Quakers and James' friendship for Penn's father led them to spare him when the Whigs were overthrown. Rather, Mr. Vulliamy suggests that the grant of Pennsylvania was extended to Penn in the pleasant expectation that he would take himself out of England, where his political activities were embarrassing and might prove dangerous.

Penn had, his biographer clearly believes, a glorious chance to make one of the great social experiments in his new province, but the curious mixture of qualities in his character spoiled that opportunity. His Quakerism and his association with Sidney the Republican and with John Locke did no more than color his "Frame of Government," which was formed rather with that respect for authority which made Penn's

course in the politics of the later Restoration so baffling to friend and foe alike, and helped to make him a Jacobite later. His bourgeois shrewdness appears in his effective, and honest, advertising of his colony, which did so much to bring in the Germans, and in his determination to handle the lands of the province so as to yield him a good income. But his careless inattention to detail and his impracticality led him to adopt the unworkable and vexatious quitrent system and to establish a form of government, with a Governor's Council of seventy-two members, too unwieldy to work well. His humanity and his Quakerism alike dictated the Indian policy and the program of religious toleration, but Penn lacked the patience to carry through the arduous business of governing a raw new commonwealth and went back to England in 1684, after less than two years in Pennsylvania, leaving the colony to its turbulent and futile political history. That his return to England was for the relief of the Quakers, suffering under a new persecution, can hardly be maintained—others were the real leaders of the Quakers in England, and Penn's place was in Pennsylvania. Rather, his return seems to have demonstrated his egotistic desire for prominence, a desire which he gratified at the court of His Majesty James II, where, bland, beaming, and hatted, he displayed the curious spectacle of a Quaker courtier at the court of a Catholic sovereign. Pennsylvania was left to shift for itself, Penn exercising negligible influence from England and his appointees as Deputy-Governors (military men for the most part) being very poor selections. Going out to the colony again in 1699 for a two years' stay, Penn was able to accomplish little or nothing. But he had left his mark upon Pennsylvania, and in more than her name, for it seems reasonable to trace her troubled political history and her racial heterogeneity to Penn as well as those matters more commonly ascribed to him. The success of the Colony, however, was not his to make or mar: that was the achievement of her sturdy settlers and the gift of her rich lands.

Maurice C. Latta.

Olivet College, Olivet, Mich.

BISHOPS AID REFORM, 1215-1272

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE LATERAN COUNCIL OF 1215

By MARION GIBBS AND JANE LANG. London: Oxford University Press, 1932. viii, 216 pages. \$4.25.

This volume is not a joint work in the usual sense of the term but two separate theses under the titles of "The Episcopate during the Reign of Henry III" by Miss Gibbs, and "The Enforcement of the Decrees of the Lateran Council of 1215 in England during the Reign of Henry III" by Miss Lang. The former occupies the first 93 pages, the latter pages 94—179, and the remaining pages are occupied by appendices, bibliography and two indexes. The fact indicated at the outset should be borne in mind in reading and judging the work, which is the fruit of two independent approaches to an evaluation of the

effects of the Council, under the general guidance of Professor F. M. Powicke, the biographer of Stephen Langton.

The work forms an interesting sequel to Dr. Z. I. Brooke's *The English Church and the Papacy*, which brings the problem down to 1215. In these lectures the author shows the importance of two factors in ecclesiastical development—the *personnel* of the higher clergy and the higher clergy and the circulation of manuscripts of Canon Law. In the volume before us, which is a contemporary but independent of Dr. Brooke's lectures, Miss Gibbs examines the sources of the bishops and archbishops, dividing them into the four main classes of monks, administrators and magnates, scholars, and cathedral clergy. She then analyses the data concerning the procedure and conduct of the elections in the period. Miss Lang takes the second line, examining the promulgation of the Decrees, their influence on the episcopal legislation and their application to local affairs.

The results of these two lines of investigation are interesting, in that the papacy, apart from a certain rapacity in its taxation, emerges in a far better light than former works on the subject have led us to expect. Nevertheless, although its influence is frequently exerted on behalf of the maintenance of law and order, and the support of the Crown, there exists throughout the note of the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals—the need of an external independent judge to enforce the claim of the spiritual against secular invasions of their rights. Accompanying these factors are the general laxity, passivity and frequent ignorance of the higher clergy in the enforcement of necessary reform. It is disconcerting too to notice that the general tone of the English church was higher than the tone elsewhere. Grosseteste, the Le Poores and the Langtons stand out prominently in their endeavors to promote a healthy church life, but they are limited by the factors already mentioned. One point, in conclusion, deserves special attention. Both writers have succeeded in producing material of interest in the Maitland-Stubbs controversy on canon law in the Church of England, generally in favor of the late Bishop of Oxford.

F. W. Buckler.

The Graduate School of Theology,
Oberlin College.

THE SEPARATED EASTERN CHURCHES

By REV. PERE JANIN. London: Sands and Co., 1933. 243 pages. 5 s.

This translation of the original French edition, *Les Églises séparées d'Orient* (1930) was prepared by Canon P. Boylan. The work consists of sketchy historical surveys of the various Eastern communions, to which is appended a statement of the organization of each ecclesiastical unit. It is to be regretted that the translator has not attempted (with but two exceptions) to bring the current developments up to date. But on the whole the work is one of the most concise and informing surveys of the subject extant. For general information, it is fairly satisfactory.

The present reviewer is unable to agree with the author regarding the admittedly difficult subject of statistics; he is certain that whatever are the present numbers of members of the various Russian Orthodox bodies, of the Raskol, and of the sects, it is not correct to use the pre-Revolutionary figures for these bodies as the author has done. That number must be most radically reduced, although in the absence of all reliable statistics on the matter, it is not possible to say what the actual membership is. On the other hand, in listing the Czechoslovak Orthodox group at 45,000, the author has greatly reduced the number, for that communion comprises 175,000 members (counting the Sub-Carpathian Orthodox with the Czechs). It is incorrect to say that the Bulgarian priests made translations of the Scriptures and the liturgical books for the newly organized Russian church (p. 93), for these texts had been in use in the Bulgarian church for almost a century, previously to the conversion of Russia, and were merely imported into Russia. Patriarch Tikhon, when elected to his office, held the metropolitan see of Moscow, not Yaroslav and Rostov (p. 100). Agathangel was metropolitan of Yaroslav, not of Jerusalem (p. 101); there are several other misprints which I shall not point out because they are obvious to the reader. To translate the term "popovtsy" by "Presbyterians" rather than "priestly" is quite misleading; for this P  re Janin is responsible (p. 114). But the ludicrous mistranslation of "*edinovertsy*" as "Unbelievers" (in the French original *unicroyants*) must be charged to the translator's account. It is also difficult to understand upon what authority the statement is made that in 1928 the Russian Communist party comprised only 800,000 members (p. 117). In referring to the conversion of Serbia, the author is wrong in referring to Stephen the First-crowned as Stephen II (p. 122), and particularly is he in fault in affirming that the Serbian church was in communion with Rome till "the disappearance of the Latin Empire" (p. 123). The emigration under Patriarch Arsenius in 1690 was not into Slavonia (p. 124) but into southern Hungary. The translator throughout the book has followed the French spelling of proper names; did he not know the accepted English form of those names? On the other hand, why not Capo d'Istria instead of Capo of Istria? Why is southern Hungary referred to as "the territory of the Emperor of Germany"? It does not seem worth while to make a complete catalogue of such misstatements. Suffice it to say that the information afforded by the book is in general fairly reliable, although it contains a rather surprisingly large number of minor errors.

Matthew Spinka.

Chicago Theological Seminary.

SAINTS, SINNERS AND BEECHERS

By LYMAN BEECHER STOWE. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1934. 450 pages, illustrations. \$3.75.

To reduce this delightful and important book to prosaic terms, it is a series of biographical sketches of Lyman Beecher and his six sons

and four daughters, written by a grandson of Harriet Beecher Stowe. No account is given of another son, George, because his life was cut short at the opening of his service as a minister in Rochester, N. Y. The title comes from the famous remark of Dr. Leonard Bacon of New Haven about the population of the United States—which suggests that the Bacons offer material for another delightful and important book. Mr. Stowe is true to his heredity by being unconventional in method and manner. His treatment of his subjects is candid, anecdotal, conversational, richly humorous. While he keeps far from a precise recital of the facts of careers, he gets before the reader's mind the significant things in changes of residence and achievements. Out of it all emerge distinct unforgettable personalities, in the less known as well as the better known members of the family, and incisive records of the results of their lives. The reviewer finds that other readers agree with him in thinking that of all these wonderfully interesting people Thomas K. Beecher of Elmira is the one they would most have wished to know.

Naturally Henry Ward and Mrs. Stowe receive the fullest treatment. A hundred pages vividly depict the character and the works of the former. Paxton Hibben's indictment and its apparent acceptance by many of our "intelligentsia" under the power of the idea reigning in these circles that anything to the discredit of an influential Protestant minister must be true provide sufficient occasion for giving considerable space to Beecher's relations with Theodore Tilton and his wife. Mr. Stowe's review of the record, including the retractions of two of the counsel for Beecher's accusers, sets in the case in very different light from that thrown by Captain Hibben. Since Mr. Stowe has been criticized in reviews for including the story about Lincoln's visit *incog.* to Beecher, it ought to be noticed that he says that its truth has been maintained and denied by good authorities, and that he is "disposed to believe it." The account of Mrs. Stowe, especially the chapter "As Her Friends and Family Knew Her," contains much material to which only a member of the family would have access. It is a striking record, not equalled elsewhere, of her extraordinary life.

Mr. Stowe finds a unity in the Beechers in that they "played a significant part in the transition from heaven and theology to this world and service." He has a strong antipathy to "theology," which he appears to identify with the form of Calvinism taught by Lyman Beecher. There are other kinds of theology. On the basis of the history of Calvinistic Christianity an argument might be maintained respecting Mr. Stowe's contention that Lyman Beecher was a reformer of society in spite of his religious thinking. There can be no argument about the impact of the Beechers on this world. The overpowering feature of the book is the effect of this family on American life, and life in other lands. In theology—*pace* Mr. Stowe, in church policy, in moral reform—duelling, temperance, and slavery, in education, especially of women, in the Civil War and reconstruction, in the woman's suffrage movement the Beechers were creative powers, working revolutionary advances. They educated the public mind and quickened the public conscience on a vast scale. The history of the family cannot be written without writing a large part of American history in their period. Mr. Stowe's book con-

tributes significantly to the philosophy of history by an impressive exhibition of the social effects of energetic personalities, and also of the work of religious motives in forming and maintaining these personalities. The bibliography of publications by and about the Beechers and the full index should be mentioned.

Robert Hasting Nichols.

Auburn Theological Seminary.

WILLEM SEWEL OF AMSTERDAM

By WILLIAM I. HULL. Swarthmore College Monographs on Quaker History, Number One, 1933. 225 pages. \$2.00.

All readers of Charles Lamb remember the glowing tribute the essayist paid to the work of Sewel. He recommended Sewel's *History of the Quakers* "above all church-narratives," and held it to be both "edifying and affecting." The general reader's knowledge of Sewel has been slight, but this lack may now be overcome by the use of Professor Hull's valuable monograph.

The present work is a single section of the author's intended study of the entire history of Quakerism in Holland. Swarthmore College announces ten monographs in the series by Professor Hull, all of them dealing with Dutch Quakerism, except number three, which concerns early biographies of William Penn in many lands and languages. The author has been collecting his material for twenty-seven years, having at his command various archives in Holland, the Friends Reference Library in London, and various American collections, including the valuable one in the Swarthmore library. The work has been carried on in a scholarly fashion, but the evidences of scholarship have not detracted from the interest of the narrative.

Willem Sewel (1653-1720) was the first Quaker historian of Quakerism, but not its first historian. He was preceded, surprisingly, not by an English scholar, but by a fellow Dutchman, Gerard Croese, whose *Historia Quakeriana* was published first in Latin in 1695. Croese was aided in this by an account especially prepared by George Fox, and also by material provided by Sewel. The inaccurate work of Croese was quite eclipsed when Sewel's *magnum opus* appeared in 1717. The great *History* came as the climax to a life full of literary labors, especially devoted to translations into Dutch. Appendix A of the present volume lists thirty-seven published writings and translations from Sewel's pen.

One of the most valuable parts of Professor Hull's monograph is Chapter IV, which includes translations of many letters from Sewel to William Penn. The letters from 1686 to 1687 are given *in extenso*, since they have never been published before in English, Dutch, or the original Latin. Sewel was a keen critic as well as a good translator and saved Penn from some mistakes. In writing to Bishop Burnet, Sewel said, "he who knows me best is William Penn, Governor of Pennsylvania." We learn also that Sewel was for a short time an amanuensis for Fox.

Professor Hull points out that Quakerism owes a twofold debt to Sewel. He labored, on the one hand, to nourish the infant Quakerism of Holland, and, on the other, to show the story of its beginning in all lands where the Quaker seed was planted by his heroic contemporaries. The memory of an important figure in the history of church history has been adequately preserved.

D. Elton Trueblood,

Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.

THE REFORMATION AND THE CONTEMPLATIVE LIFE

By DAVID MATHEW AND GERVASE MATHEW. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1934. 321 pages. \$2.50.

This essay in musical prose on the experience of the Carthusians in the Reformation combines carefully gleaned information with historical imagination to form a commendable book. The picture of Carthusian life is unfolded in an attractive way. The interest of the book gathers about the contrast of the simplicity and innocence of this stainless order and the merciless forces of nationalism and royal ambition in the outside world which they were not in the slightest degree able to understand. Leo X had been kind to the order, and they lamented the death of their papal patron, without the least suspicion of the fact that his successors would be unable to protest them. Those who remembered Leo would recall at the Grande Chartreuse: "His Holiness' patience in his delicate health, the spy-glass which he always carried to assist his weak vision, the habit of peering at questioners through his prominent near-sighted eyes, the prosperous habit of body, the beautiful hands, and . . . that generous welcoming courtesy through which the man was expressed." They knew nothing of the thickening storm-clouds that hung over his later years. Almost at the moment of Leo's death in 1521, Dom Guillaume Babauce, an aged saint whose "experience had ended in 1499," became prior of the Chartreuse and thereby head of the order. Devoid of worldly interests, and trusting his world to befriend the Carthusians as the medieval world had done, he was to play the part of a bewildered and largely inactive leader while houses and provinces of the order were being brought to destruction.

The work of destruction began with the peasant war in Germany. A number of houses in the Main valley were looted and wrecked by the rebels. The Carthusians of France fondly thought the princes who slew the peasants would prove the order's friends. They were distressed to learn that the house at Nuremberg was suppressed soon afterwards by the city authorities, and that most of the monks had accepted without reluctance their freedom from the cloister. Suppressions continued in Germany. The Turkish campaigns in Hungary destroyed a number of small houses. Till 1532 the Carthusians had not begun to see the possibility of trouble for themselves in England. In that year a German Carthusian had addressed Henry VIII in the words: "*Serenissime Rex Henrice atque Christi athleta invictissime.*" Henry's chancellor, More,

was the intimate friend of the monks of the Charterhouse. The royal marriage question was a matter of little importance for the pious contemplatives. They hesitated when to their surprise they were asked to accept the Act of Succession, and therewith the marriage of Anne Boleyn which the pope disallowed. Imprisonment, and the persuasion of the archbishop of York and the bishop of London, brought them to yield. Fisher and More went to prison over the Act of Supremacy. They now had Cromwell to deal with—a designing man for whom religion was a protective coloring only, and who regarded the Carthusian affair as a mere incident in an ambitious program. Misunderstanding his motives they sought his favor. But in the end their leaders made a life and death issue of the royal supremacy, and went to the block for high treason at Tyburn.

The whole book may teach us that those who are harmless as doves ought also to be wise as serpents. But the greatest wisdom and activity on the part of Bibauce might not have effected a favorable result. The fact that on the Continent suppression went on with little resistance from monks or people, and that in England even the martyrdom of prior Houghton brought no perceptible reaction, can only mean that the institution of monasticism had a slight appeal to that generation.

John T. McNeill.

The University of Chicago.

HISTORY OF ANDOVER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

By HENRY K. ROWE. Newton Center, Mass.: Andover—Newton Theological Seminary, 1933. \$1.00

Dr. Rowe in this small volume gives a vivid description and high appreciation of a theological institution. He tells the interesting story of its founding one hundred and twenty-five years ago, and we learn from him the aims and purposes of the founders in their endeavor to defend the Evangelical faith when Harvard became liberal or Unitarian in its theological position. The picture of the Seminary life in the early years is fascinating, and the earnestness of the students and the rigorousness of their lives make one feel that theological students have gone "soft" since. The school was most hospitable to students of all denominations who sought its privileges and it served the various churches well in providing them with educated ministers.

The faculty was composed, in its early, middle, and late periods, of outstanding men in the field of scholarship, who did notable service for scholarship and the progress of the churches, and especially in providing missionary fields with learned and devoted men. Its list of graduates shows their eminence and prominence in education and literature, theology, and the churches. It was ever a progressive school, and was the first institution to welcome new light and to champion the cause of the new freedom in theology.

The tragic element in its founding and history lies in the attempt to bind it to a system of theology that was inevitably doomed from its

own inconsistency, and from the progress of the world's thought. The chapter which deals with its removal from Andover to Cambridge, and its merger with Harvard, and the Supreme Court's decision against such a union, and its new merger with the Newton Theological Institution to form the Andover Newton Theological School, is full of wisdom, encouragement and hope for other institutions. In its new location and relation, it bids fair to be as great a servant to the churches as it was in its earlier days. It is a good story of an institution and admirably told by Dr. Rowe.

Daniel Evans.

CREATIVE MEN

By WILLIAM FRASER McDOWELL. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1934. 246 pages. \$2.00.

This book contains the 1933-34 Lectures in Christian Biography at Drew Theological Seminary. Because of wide reading, varied activities in educational and administrative work, and personal contact with former leaders of American Methodism, the author is highly qualified to write upon the theme he chose.

His "creative men" are chosen from the ranks of conspicuous individuals such as Asbury, Simpson, Andrews, Hurst, Thoburn, and Bashford, all bishops but one. Instead of brief biographical sketches, however, we meet interpretations and illuminating discussions dealing with significant church functions and movements. The individuals selected are brought into the picture as types or exponents of these functions. The reader will perhaps be disappointed to find so little biographical material, especially from one so well fitted to offer it. Nevertheless, characteristic traits of life, revelations of power, keen insights into human nature abound to instruct and to inspire. One gains a new appreciation of the significance of these pioneers in their respective fields of labor. Thus the builder, the preacher, the overseer, the educator, and the missionary are pictured in their Kingdom-building capacities. The final chapter on "The Master: The Biography of Christian Experience" is especially vivid and rewarding in its treatment of the inner springs of spirituality, unfolding, unconsciously perhaps, the matured religious convictions of one who has lived much, thought deeply, and experienced richly.

This book is of value to the general reader because of its instructive as well as inspirational nature. The historians will find in it the portrayal of an expanding religious drama so far as it concerns one denomination as well as source material of importance for the generation just closing.

A. W. Nagler.

Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.

BOOK NOTICES

ONE HUNDRED AND TEN MIRACLES OF OUR LADY MARY

Translated by SIR E. A. WALLIS BUDGE. New York: Oxford University Press, 1933. lvii, 355 pages. \$4.25.

This collection of Ethiopian stories of miracles performed by the Virgin reveals the interesting fact that most of them were derived from Byzantine, European and Arabic sources, and therefore have a close family likeness to mediaeval miracle stories in general. In fact, many of them are found in a Latin or French version which, for purposes of comparison, are in some cases appended. The translator has used for his sources three best Ethiopian manuscripts of the sources which are found in the British Museum. The stories themselves depict the Virgin as the capricious, praise-loving and intensely feminine Notre Dame which Henry Adams so charmingly described in his *Mont Saint Michel and Chartres*, or Caesarius of Heisterbach in his *Dialogue on Miracles*.

M. S.

THE MYSTICISM OF IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH

By FREDERICK AUGUSTUS SCHILLING. Author, College Place, Washington, 1932. 75 pages.

This is a doctoral dissertation presented to the University of Pennsylvania. The author stresses Ignatius' mysticism rather than an absorbing interest in the episcopal organization of the church as the chief characteristic revealed by the martyr's letters. On the basis of this characterization, he stresses Ignatius' Platonic conception of the "catholic church," the concept of Christianity as a mystery religion with Christ as the cult-god, and the prophetic vocation of the martyr. The work is well done, and would deserve to be made generally available.

M. S.

LIPANY

By F. M. BARTOS. Phara: Svaz Národního Osvobození, 1934. 96 pages. Kč. 6.—

This short brochure was written in commemoration of the five hundredth anniversary of the tragic battle at Lipany (May 30, 1434) which marked the first defeat of the various Husite armies by the nobles,

assisted by the Czech Catholics and foreign forces most generously paid by the Council of Basle. The author particularly stresses the leading part played by the Council in engineering the diplomatic maneuvers which divided the Czech military forces and which in the end resulted in the defeat of the democratic and middle class elements organized in the Taborite and Orphan brotherhoods. The booklet presents a penetrating revaluation of this important event by one of the best historians of the Husite movement.

M. S.

